

ИНСТИТУТ МАРКСИЗМА-ЛЕНИНИЗМА при ЦК КПСС

В. И. Л Е Н И Н
С О Ч И Н Е Н И Я

Издание четвертое

**ГОСУДАРСТВЕННОЕ ИЗДАТЕЛЬСТВО
ПОЛИТИЧЕСКОЙ ЛИТЕРАТУРЫ
МОСКВА**

V. I. L E N I N

COLLECTED WORKS

VOLUME
28

July 1918 – March 1919

PROGRESS PUBLISHERS
M O S C O W

**TRANSLATED FROM THE RUSSIAN
EDITED BY JIM RIORDAN**

CONTENTS

| | Page |
|---|------|
| Preface | 15 |
| <i>1918</i> | |
| SPEECH AT A JOINT SESSION OF THE ALL-RUSSIA CENTRAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, THE MOSCOW SOVIET, FACTORY COMMITTEES AND TRADE UNIONS OF MOSCOW, <i>July 29, 1918</i> | 18 |
| SPEECH AT A CONGRESS OF CHAIRMEN OF GUBERNIA SOVIETS, <i>July 30, 1918. Newspaper Report</i> | 35 |
| SPEECH AT A MEETING OF THE WARSAW REVOLUTIONARY REGIMENT, <i>August 2, 1918. Newspaper Report</i> | 38 |
| SPEECH AT A MEETING IN BUTYRSKY DISTRICT, <i>August 2, 1918. Newspaper Report</i> | 41 |
| SPEECH AT A RALLY OF RED ARMY MEN AT KHODYNKA, <i>August 2, 1918. Brief Newspaper Report</i> | 44 |
| THESES ON THE FOOD QUESTION. <i>For the Commissariats of Food, Agriculture, the Supreme Economic Council, Finance, Trade and Industry</i> | 45 |
| ADMISSION TO HIGHER EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION. <i>Draft Decision of the Council of People's Commissars</i> | 48 |
| LETTER TO YELETS WORKERS | 49 |
| SPEECH AT A MEETING IN SOKOLNIKI DISTRICT, <i>August 9, 1918. Brief Newspaper Report</i> | 52 |
| COMRADE WORKERS, FORWARD TO THE LAST, DECISIVE FIGHT! | 54 |
| DRAFT OF TELEGRAM TO ALL SOVIETS OF DEPUTIES CONCERNING THE WORKER-PEASANT ALLIANCE | 59 |
| SPEECHES AT A MEETING OF THE MOSCOW PARTY COMMITTEE ON ORGANISING GROUPS OF SYMPATHISERS, <i>August 16, 1918. Minutes</i> | 60 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| LETTER TO AMERICAN WORKERS | 62 |
| SPEECH AT A MEETING IN THE ALEXEYEV PEOPLE'S HOUSE, <i>August 23, 1918. Brief Newspaper Report</i> | 76 |
| SPEECH IN POLYTECHNICAL MUSEUM, <i>August 23, 1918</i> | 79 |
| SPEECH AT THE FIRST ALL-RUSSIA CONGRESS ON EDUCATION, <i>August 28, 1918</i> | 85 |
| SPEECH AT A MEETING IN BASMANNY DISTRICT, <i>August 30, 1918.</i> <i>Brief Newspaper Report</i> | 89 |
| SPEECH AT A MEETING AT THE FORMER MICHELSON WORKS, <i>August 30, 1918. Brief Newspaper Report</i> | 90 |
| GREETINGS TO THE RED ARMY ON THE CAPTURE OF KAZAN | 93 |
| LETTER TO THE PRESIDIUM OF THE CONFERENCE OF PROLETARIAN CULTURAL AND EDUCATIONAL ORGANISATIONS . . . | 94 |
| TELEGRAM TO OFFICER CADETS IN PETROGRAD | 95 |
| THE CHARACTER OF OUR NEWSPAPERS | 96 |
| TELEGRAM TO THE PENZA GUBERNIA EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AND THE REVOLUTIONARY WAR COUNCIL OF THE FIRST ARMY | 99 |
| LETTER TO RED ARMY MEN WHO TOOK PART IN THE CAPTURE OF KAZAN | 100 |
| LETTER TO A JOINT SESSION OF THE ALL-RUSSIA CENTRAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, THE MOSCOW SOVIET AND REPRESENTATIVES OF FACTORY COMMITTEES AND TRADE UNIONS, <i>October 3, 1918</i> | 101 |
| THE PROLETARIAN REVOLUTION AND THE RENEGADE KAUTSKY | 105 |
| REPORT AT A JOINT SESSION OF THE ALL-RUSSIA CENTRAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, THE MOSCOW SOVIET, FACTORY COMMITTEES AND TRADE UNIONS, <i>October 22, 1918</i> | 114 |
| RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT A JOINT SESSION OF THE ALL-RUSSIA CENTRAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, THE MOSCOW SOVIET, FACTORY COMMITTEES AND TRADE UNIONS, <i>October 22, 1918</i> . | 128 |
| SPEECH AT A RALLY IN HONOUR OF THE AUSTRO-HUNGARIAN REVOLUTION, <i>November 3, 1918. Brief Newspaper Report</i> . . . | 131 |
| SPEECH AT A CEREMONIAL MEETING OF THE ALL-RUSSIA CENTRAL AND MOSCOW TRADE UNION COUNCILS, <i>November 6, 1918. Newspaper Report</i> | 132 |

| | |
|--|------------|
| EXTRAORDINARY SIXTH ALL-RUSSIA CONGRESS OF SOVIETS OF WORKERS', PEASANTS' COSSACKS' AND RED ARMY DEPUTIES, November 6-9, 1918 | 135 |
| 1. SPEECH ON THE ANNIVERSARY OF THE REVOLUTION, November 6 | 137 |
| 2. SPEECH ON THE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION, November 8 | 151 |
| SPEECH AT THE UNVEILING OF A MEMORIAL TO MARX AND ENGELS, November 7, 1918 | 165 |
| SPEECH AT THE UNVEILING OF A MEMORIAL PLAQUE TO THOSE WHO FELL IN THE OCTOBER REVOLUTION, November 7, 1918 . | 167 |
| SPEECH AT A RALLY AND CONCERT FOR THE ALL-RUSSIA EXTRAORDINARY COMMISSION STAFF, November 7, 1918 | 169 |
| SPEECH AT A MEETING OF DELEGATES FROM THE POOR PEASANTS' COMMITTEES OF CENTRAL GUBERNIAS, November 8, 1918 | 171 |
| TELEGRAM TO ALL SOVIETS OF DEPUTIES, TO EVERYONE | 179 |
| SPEECH AT THE FIRST ALL-RUSSIA CONGRESS OF WORKING WOMEN, November 19, 1918 | 180 |
| SPEECH AT A RALLY IN LENIN'S HONOUR, November 20, 1918. | |
| <i>Brief Newspaper Report</i> | 183 |
| THE VALUABLE ADMISSIONS OF PITIRIM SOROKIN | 185 |
| SPEECH ON RED OFFICERS' DAY, November 24, 1918 | 195 |
| SPEECH DELIVERED TO A MEETING OF DELEGATES FROM THE MOSCOW CENTRAL WORKERS' CO-OPERATIVE, November 26, 1918 | 196 |
| MOSCOW PARTY WORKERS' MEETING, November 27, 1918 | 201 |
| 1. REPORT ON THE ATTITUDE OF THE PROLETARIAT TO PETTY-BOURGEOIS DEMOCRATS | 201 |
| 2. REPLY TO THE DISCUSSION OF REPORT ON THE ATTITUDE OF THE PROLETARIAT TO PETTY-BOURGEOIS DEMOCRATS | 217 |
| TELEGRAM TO COMMANDER-IN-CHIEF | 225 |
| THE PROLETARIAN REVOLUTION AND THE RENEGADE KAUTSKY | 227 |
| Preface | 229 |
| How Kautsky Turned Marx into a Common Liberal | 231 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| Bourgeois and Proletarian Democracy | 242 |
| Can There Be Equality Between the Exploited and the Exploiter? | 250 |
| The Soviets Dare Not Become State Organisations . | 257 |
| The Constituent Assembly and the Soviet Republic . | 263 |
| The Soviet Constitution | 271 |
| What Is Internationalism? | 280 |
| Subservience to the Bourgeoisie in the Guise of "Eco- nomic Analysis" | 294 |
| <i>Appendix I.</i> Theses on the Constituent Assembly | 319 |
| <i>Appendix II.</i> Vandervelde's New Book on the State | 319 |
| DRAFT DECISION ON THE USE OF STATE CONTROL | 326 |
| SPEECH TO THE MOSCOW GUBERNIA CONGRESS OF SOVIETS, POOR PEASANTS' COMMITTEES AND DISTRICT COMMITTEES OF THE RUSSIAN COMMUNIST PARTY (BOLSHEVIKS), <i>December 8, 1918.</i> <i>Brief Newspaper Report</i> | 327 |
| SPEECH TO THE THIRD WORKERS' CO-OPERATIVE CONGRESS, <i>December 9, 1918</i> | 329 |
| SPEECH TO THE FIRST ALL-RUSSIA CONGRESS OF LAND DEPART- MENTS, POOR PEASANTS' COMMITTEES AND COMMUNES, <i>December 11, 1918</i> | 338 |
| ROUGH DRAFT OF RULES FOR THE ADMINISTRATION OF SOVIET INSTITUTIONS | 349 |
| 1 | 349 |
| 2 | 350 |
| 3 | 351 |
| DRAFT DECISION OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE RUSSIAN COMMUNIST PARTY (BOLSHEVIKS) | 353 |
| SPEECH AT A PRESNYA DISTRICT WORKERS' CONFERENCE, <i>December 14, 1918</i> | 354 |
| TELEGRAM TO THE SAMARA UKRAINIANS | 367 |
| "DEMOCRACY" AND DICTATORSHIP | 368 |
| HEROISM OF THE PRESNYA WORKERS | 373 |
| SPEECH TO THE SECOND ALL-RUSSIA CONGRESS OF ECONOMIC COUNCILS <i>December 25, 1918</i> | 375 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| TASKS OF THE TRADE UNIONS | 382 |
| I | 382 |
| II | 382 |
| III | 383 |
| A LITTLE PICTURE IN ILLUSTRATION OF BIG PROBLEMS | 386 |

1919

| | |
|---|-----|
| TELEGRAM TO STALIN AND DZERZHINSKY | 390 |
| SPEECH AT A JOINT SESSION OF THE ALL-RUSSIA CENTRAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, THE MOSCOW SOVIET AND ALL-RUSSIA TRADE UNION CONGRESS, <i>January 17, 1919</i> | 391 |
| SPEECH AT THE MOSCOW CITY CONFERENCE OF THE RUSSIAN COMMUNIST PARTY (BOLSHEVIKS), <i>January 18, 1919. Brief Newspaper Report</i> | 405 |
| SPEECH AT THE SECOND ALL-RUSSIA CONGRESS OF INTERNATIONALIST TEACHERS, <i>January 18, 1919</i> | 407 |
| SPEECH AT A PROTEST RALLY FOLLOWING THE MURDER OF KARL LIEBKNECHT AND ROSA LUXEMBURG, <i>January 19, 1919. Brief Newspaper Report</i> | 411 |
| REPORT AT THE SECOND ALL-RUSSIA TRADE UNION CONGRESS, <i>January 20, 1919</i> | 412 |
| LETTER TO THE WORKERS OF EUROPE AND AMERICA | 429 |
| SPEECH AT THE SECOND CONFERENCE OF HEADS OF ADULT EDUCATION DIVISIONS OF GUBERNIA EDUCATION DEPARTMENTS, <i>January 24, 1919</i> | 437 |
| EVERYBODY ON FOOD AND TRANSPORT WORK! | 439 |
| MEASURES GOVERNING THE TRANSITION FROM BOURGEOIS-CO-OPERATIVE TO PROLETARIAN-COMMUNIST SUPPLY AND DISTRIBUTION | 443 |
| TELEGRAM TO UFA GUBERNIA REVOLUTIONARY COMMITTEE | 445 |
| DRAFT WIRELESS MESSAGE FROM PEOPLE'S COMMISSAR FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS | 446 |
| CLOSURE OF THE MENSHEVIK NEWSPAPER UNDERMINING THE COUNTRY'S DEFENCE. <i>All-Russia Central Executive Committee Draft Resolution</i> | 447 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| TO THE PEOPLE'S COMMISSARIAT OF EDUCATION | 451 |
| <i>FIRST CONGRESS OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL, March 2-6, 1919</i> | 453 |
| 1. SPEECH AT THE OPENING SESSION OF THE CONGRESS, <i>March 2</i> | 455 |
| 2. THESES AND REPORT ON BOURGEOIS DEMOCRACY AND THE DICTATORSHIP OF THE PROLETARIAT, <i>March 4</i> | 457 |
| 3. RESOLUTION TO THE THESES ON BOURGEOIS DEMOCRACY AND THE DICTATORSHIP OF THE PROLETARIAT | 475 |
| 4. CONCLUDING SPEECH AT THE CLOSING SESSION OF THE CONGRESS, <i>March 6</i> | 476 |
| WON AND RECORDED | 478 |
| FOUNDING OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL, <i>Speech at a Joint Meeting of the All-Russia Central Executive Commit- tee, the Moscow Soviet, the Moscow Committee of the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks), the All-Russia Central Council of Trade Unions, Moscow Trade Unions and Factory Committees to Mark the Founding of the Communist Interna- tional, March 6, 1919</i> | 481 |
| NOTE TO STALIN ON REORGANISATION OF STATE CONTROL . . | 486 |
| Notes | 487 |
| <i>The Life and Work of V. I. Lenin. Outstanding Dates</i> | 535 |

ILLUSTRATIONS

| | |
|---|---------|
| Portrait of V. I. Lenin. October 1918 | 16-17 |
| First page of the manuscript "Comrade Workers, Forward to the Last, Decisive Fight!" First part of August 1918 . | 54-55 |
| Cover of the pamphlet <i>The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky, 1918</i> | 228-229 |
| First page of the manuscript "To the People's Commissariat of Education", <i>February 1919</i> | 449 |

PREFACE

Volume 28 contains works written by Lenin between July 29, 1918 and early March 1919, the initial period of the Civil War and foreign intervention.

In his classic *The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky* Lenin expounds his ideas on the Soviet state, analyses the essence of Soviet democracy as the highest form of democracy in class society, explains how Soviet democracy is diametrically opposed to bourgeois democracy, and exposes opportunism and the servility of Kautsky and other leaders of the Second International to imperialism. More on Soviet and bourgeois democracy may be found in "Democracy' and Dictatorship", "Letter to American Workers", "Letter to the Workers of Europe and America", "Won and Recorded", and in the theses and speeches on the founding of the Third International.

Many items here are reports and speeches delivered at workers' meetings, congresses of Soviets and trade unions, sittings of the All-Russia Central Executive Committee, the Moscow City Conference of the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks) and elsewhere.

All these speeches and reports centre on organisation of defence, all-out support for the Red Army and the bolstering of the army's rear, thus illustrating Lenin's work at that time as Party and state leader.

Several works deal with promotion of the socialist revolution in the countryside and attitude towards the middle peasants. Among these are: "Letter to Yelets Workers", "Comrade Workers, Forward to the Last, Decisive Fight!", speech on the anniversary of the revolution to the Extraordinary Sixth All-Russia Congress of Soviets on November

6, 1918, speeches to delegates from Poor Peasants' Committees of central gubernias on November 8, 1918, and at the First All-Russia Congress of Land Departments, Poor Peasants' Committees and Communes on December 11, 1918.

In his well-known article "The Valuable Admissions of Pitirim Sorokin", Lenin advocates the policy of agreement and alliance with the middle peasant; this is later approved by the Eighth Party Congress.

In the anniversary speech on November 6, 1918, in his report at a meeting of Moscow Party workers on November 27, 1918, and elsewhere, Lenin justifies the proletariat's policy towards the petty-bourgeois democrats in connection with their turn to the Soviet side, and points the way to winning over the intellectuals and old specialists to the socialist cause.

In "Letter to American Workers", speech on the international situation delivered to the Sixth Congress of Soviets on November 8, 1918, speech at the Third Congress of Workers' Co-operatives on December 9, speech at a workers' conference in Presnya District on December 14 (published in full for the first time in the fourth Russian edition of Lenin's *Collected Works*) and in many other works, Lenin exposes British and American imperialism which would not stop at smothering weak nations and destroying European culture to gain world supremacy.

The volume also contains a number of works published for the first time in the fourth Russian edition of the *Collected Works*, most of which are drafts of government decisions and letters and telegrams very relevant to the rest of the volume's contents.

The items "Greetings to the Red Army on the Capture of Kazan", "Letter to Red Army Men Who Took Part in the Capture of Kazan", and telegrams to the Penza Gubernia Executive Committee and the Revolutionary War Council of the First Army and to officer cadets in Petrograd deal with defence matters.

More thoughts on strengthening the peasant-worker alliance are contained in the "Draft of Telegram to All Soviets of Deputies Concerning the Worker-Peasant Alliance" and in a speech delivered to the Moscow Gubernia Congress

of Soviets, Poor Peasants' Committees and District Committees of the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks) on December 8, 1918.

Lenin's work in promoting culture and economic development is reflected in the documents: "Admission to Higher Educational Institutions of the Russian Federation", "Draft Decision of the Council of People's Commissars", "Draft Decision on the Use of State Control", "Speech at the Second Conference of Heads of Adult Education Divisions of Gubernia Education Departments, January 24, 1919" and in a letter "To the People's Commissariat of Education" on the subject of setting up and running libraries.

The items first published in the fourth Russian edition of the *Collected Works* also include "Telegram to All Soviets of Deputies, to Everyone" concerning the beginning of revolution in Germany, the draft of the theses "Tasks of the Trade Unions", the draft resolution of the All-Russia Central Executive Committee "Closure of the Menshevik Newspaper Undermining the Country's Defence" and the "Draft Wireless Message from People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs".



V. I. LENIN
October 1918

SPEECH AT A JOINT SESSION OF THE ALL-RUSSIA
CENTRAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE,
THE MOSCOW SOVIET, FACTORY COMMITTEES
AND TRADE UNIONS OF MOSCOW
JULY 29, 1918¹

(Applause, which grows into ovation.) Comrades, this is not the first time we have pointed out in the Party press, in Soviet institutions and in our agitation among the people that the period up to the new harvest will be the most difficult, arduous and crucial phase in the socialist revolution that has begun in Russia. Now, I think, we must say that this crucial situation has reached its climax. That is because it has now become perfectly clear once and for all who are the supporters of the imperialist world, of the imperialist countries, and who are the supporters of the Soviet Socialist Republic. It should first be said that from the military standpoint the position of the Soviet Republic has only now become quite clear. Many at first regarded the Czechoslovak revolt² as just one of the episodes in the chain of counter-revolutionary revolts. We did not sufficiently appreciate the news in the papers about the participation in this revolt of British and French capital, of the British and French imperialists. We must now recall how events developed in Murmansk, among the Siberian troops and in the Kuban, how the British and French, in alliance with the Czechs, with the closest co-operation of the British bourgeoisie, endeavoured to overthrow the Soviets. All these facts now show that the Czechoslovak

movement was one link in the chain long since forged by the systematic policy of the British and French imperialists to throttle Soviet Russia so as to again drag Russia into the ring of imperialist wars. This crisis must now be resolved by the broad mass of the people of Soviet Russia, for we are today faced not only with a struggle to preserve the Soviet Socialist Republic from the Czech attack, as one particular counter-revolutionary assault, and not even from counter-revolutionary assaults in general, but with a struggle against the onslaught of the whole imperialist world.

I should like first of all to remind you of the fact that the direct participation of the British and French imperialists in the Czechoslovak revolt has long been established; I would remind you of an article printed by *Prukopník Svobody*, the central organ of the Czechoslovak Communist Party, on June 28 and reprinted in our press³:

"On March 7, the Department of the National Council received the first instalment from the French Consul to the amount of three million rubles.

This money was handed to a certain Mr. Šíp, an official of the Department of the National Council.

On March 9, this same Šíp received another two million and on March 25 another million, and on March 26, Mr. Bohumil Čermák, Vice-President of the National Council, received one million; on April 3, Mr. Šíp received another million.

In all, from March 7 to April 4, the French Consul paid the Department of the National Council 8 million rubles.

No dates are indicated for the following payments: Mr. Šíp one million, Mr. Bohumil Čermák one million and Mr. Šíp another million.

In addition, a sum of 188,000 rubles was paid to an unknown person. Total: 3,188,000 rubles. Together with the above-mentioned 8 million we get a total of 11,188,000 rubles paid by the French Government to the Department of the National Council.

From the British Consul the Department received £80,000. Thus, from March 7 to the date of action, the leaders of the Czech National Council received about 15 million rubles from the French and British governments, and for this sum the Czechoslovak army was sold to the French and British imperialists."

The majority of you, of course, read this report in the newspapers at the time it was published. We certainly never doubted that the imperialists and financial magnates of

Britain and France would do their very utmost to overthrow the Soviet government and place every possible obstacle in its way. But at that time the picture was not yet complete to show that what we are faced with here is a systematic, methodical and evidently long-planned counter-revolutionary military and financial campaign against the Soviet Republic, which all the representatives of British and French imperialism had evidently been preparing for months. The general trend of events becomes clear now when we review them as a whole, when we compare the Czechoslovak counter-revolutionary movement with the Murmansk landing—where we know the British have disembarked over ten thousand soldiers, and under the pretext of defending Murmansk have actually begun to advance, have occupied Kem and Soroki, have moved to the east of Soroki, and have begun to shoot our Soviet officials—and when we read in the newspapers that many thousands of railwaymen and other workers of the Far North are fleeing from these saviours and liberators, or, to give them their true name, these new imperialist bandits who are rending Russia from another end. And quite recently we received new confirmation of the character of the Anglo-French offensive against Russia.

For geographical considerations alone it is clear that the form of this imperialist offensive against Russia cannot be the same as it was in the case of Germany. There are no common frontiers with Russia, as in the case of Germany; troop strength is less. In her wars of conquest, Britain has been compelled for many decades, owing to the primarily colonial and naval character of her military might, to employ different methods of attack, to attempt chiefly to cut off her victim's supply sources, and to prefer the method of strangulation, under pretext of aid, to open, direct, blunt and outright military force. From information recently received, it is clear that Alexeyev, who has long been notorious among the Russian soldiers and workers and who recently seized the village of Tikhoretskaya, has undoubtedly been utilising the aid of British and French imperialism. There the revolt was more clear-cut, again apparently because British and French imperialism had a hand in it.

Lastly, we received news yesterday that in Baku the British and French imperialists have succeeded in making a very effective move. They have managed to secure a majority of about thirty votes in the Baku Soviet, over our Party, over the Bolsheviks, and those Left Socialist-Revolutionaries—unfortunately, very few in number—who refused to fall in with the despicable gambles and treachery of the Moscow Left Socialist-Revolutionaries,⁴ and who have remained loyal to the Soviet government in the struggle against imperialism and war. Over this nucleus in the Baku Soviet which is loyal to the Soviet government and which up to now constituted the majority, the British and French imperialists have now secured a majority of thirty votes, owing to the fact that the greater part of the Dashnaksutyun Party,⁵ the Armenian quasi-socialists, have sided with them against us. (*Reads telegram.*)

"On July 26, on the orders of People's Commissar Korganov, the Adji-Kabul detachment retired from Adji-Kabul to a position near Alyat. After the withdrawal of the Shemakha detachment from Shemakha and Maraza the enemy began to advance along the River Pirsagat valley; the first skirmish with the enemy's vanguard occurred near the village of Kubala.

Simultaneously from the south, from the direction of the Kura, a large force of cavalry began to advance towards Pirsagat. Under the circumstances, to hold Adji-Kabul we would have had to deploy all our available forces on three sides: to the west of Adji-Kabul, and to the north and south of the Navagi-Pirsagat valley. Such an extension of the front would have left us without reserves and would have made it impossible for us to strike at the enemy as we have no cavalry, and would even have endangered the group at Adji-Kabul if the front had been broken from the north or south. In view of this situation, and in order to conserve the strength of the troops, orders were given to the detachment to retreat from Adji-Kabul to a position near Alyat. The retreat was carried out in good order. Important railway installations and the Adji-Kabul station, as well as the kerosene and oil tanks, have been blown up. In Daghestan, the enemy is on the move as part of the general offensive. On July 24, the enemy advanced in large forces in four directions. After twenty-four hours' fighting we occupied the enemy's trenches; the foe dispersed into the woods and nightfall prevented further pursuit. On July 24, news of successes was received from Shura, where fighting is going on around the town; the enemy is putting up a stubborn and organised resistance, and is commanded by former Daghestan officers. Daghestan peasants are taking an active part in the fighting around Shura.

The Right-wing parties in Baku have raised their heads and are vigorously campaigning to call in the British. This campaign is strongly backed by the army officers and is being conducted among the forces at the front. Anglophil agitation has disorganised the army. The British orientation has recently been making great headway among the worn-out and despairing people.

Under the influence of the unscrupulous and provocative activities of the Right-wing parties, the Caspian flotilla has adopted several contradictory resolutions in regard to the British. Deceived by British hirelings and volunteer agents, until quite recently it blindly believed in the sincerity of British support.

Latest reports say that the British are advancing in Persia and have occupied Resht (Giljan), where for four days they have been engaged against Kuchuk-Khan and the German and Turkish bands, who have joined forces with him, headed by Mussavatists⁶ who had fled from Baku. After the Resht battle the British applied to us for assistance, but our representatives in Persia refused. The British got the upper hand in Resht. But they have practically no forces in Persia. We know they have only fifty men in Enzeli. They need petrol, in exchange for which they are offering us cars. Without petrol they are stuck.

On July 25, a second session of the Soviet was held to discuss the political and military situation, and at the insistence of the Right-wing parties the question of the British was raised. Comrade Shahumyan, Commissar Extraordinary for the Caucasus, citing the resolution of the Fifth Congress of Soviets and Stalin's telegram on behalf of the Central Council of People's Commissars, spoke against inviting the British and demanded that this question be struck from the agenda. Comrade Shahumyan's move was defeated by a small majority, whereupon, as representative of the central government, he entered a vigorous protest. The session heard the report of the delegates who had visited the front. By 259 votes of the Right Socialist-Revolutionaries, Right Dashnaks and Mensheviks against 236 votes of the Bolsheviks, Left Socialist-Revolutionaries and Left Dashnaks, a resolution was adopted to invite the British and form a government comprising members of all parties represented in the Soviet and recognising the power of the Council of People's Commissars. The resolution was sharply condemned by the Left wing. Shahumyan declared that he regarded it as a shameful betrayal and stark ingratitude towards the workers and peasants of Russia and that as the central government's representative, he renounced all responsibility for the decision. A statement was made on behalf of the group of the Bolsheviks, Left Socialist-Revolutionaries and Left Dashnaks to the effect that they would not join the coalition government and that the Council of People's Commissars would resign. Comrade Shahumyan declared in the name of the three Left groups that a government which had in fact broken with the Russian Soviet government by inviting the British imperialists would receive no support from Soviet Russia. By its treacherous policy of inviting the British, the local Soviet had lost Russia and the parties supporting the Soviet government.

The Right-wing parties were thrown into utter confusion at the decision of the Council of People's Commissars to resign. When news

of this situation got around there was an abrupt change of sentiment in the districts and at the front. The sailors realised they had been duped by traitors who want to break with Russia and bring down the Soviet government. The people are having second thoughts about the British. Yesterday, an urgent meeting of the Executive Committee was held over the resignation of the Council of People's Commissars. It was decided that all the People's Commissars should remain at their posts and continue their former functions pending decision of the question of power at the Soviet's session on July 31. The Executive Committee has decided to take urgent measures to combat the threatening counter-revolution. The foe is carrying on activities under the wing of the Anglo-French parties.

Press Bureau of the Baku Council of People's Commissars."

Not unlike the groups here who call themselves socialists but have never broken off relations with the bourgeoisie, there, too, these people came out in favour of inviting the British troops to defend Baku.⁷ We already know only too well the meaning of such an invitation to imperialist troops to defend the Soviet Republic. We know the meaning of this invitation extended by the bourgeoisie, a section of the Socialist-Revolutionaries, and by the Mensheviks. We know the meaning of this invitation extended by the Menshevik leaders in Tiflis, Georgia.

We may now say that the Bolshevik, the Communist Party is the only party which has never invited imperialists and has never entered into a rapacious alliance with them, but has only retreated before these cutthroats when they pressed too hard. (*Applause.*) We know our Communist comrades in the Caucasus were in a very difficult position because the Mensheviks betrayed them everywhere by entering into direct alliance with the German imperialists, on the pretext, of course, of defending Georgia's independence.

You are all aware that this independence of Georgia has become a sheer fraud. In actual fact it amounts to the occupation and complete seizure of Georgia by the German imperialists, an alliance of German bayonets with the Menshevik government against the Bolshevik workers and peasants. And, therefore, our Baku comrades were a thousand times right in refusing to close their eyes to the danger of the situation and saying: We would never be

opposed to peace with an imperialist power on the basis of ceding part of our territory, provided this would not harm us, would not bind our troops in an alliance with the bayonets of the aggressors and would not prevent us from carrying on our socialist reconstruction.

But since, as the question now stands, by inviting the British, supposedly for the defence of Baku, they are inviting a power which has now swallowed up the whole of Persia and which has long been moving up its forces for seizing the Southern Caucasus—that is, surrendering themselves to British and French imperialism—we cannot doubt or hesitate for a moment and must say that, however difficult the position of our Baku comrades may be, by refusing to conclude such a peace they have taken the only step worthy of true socialists. This resolute rejection of any agreement whatsoever with the British and French imperialists was the only true course for our Baku comrades to take, for you cannot invite them without converting your independent socialist government, even though on severed territory, into a slave of imperialist war.

We therefore do not entertain the slightest doubt as to the significance of the Baku events in the general scheme of things. Yesterday, news was received that counter-revolutionary revolts have broken out in a number of towns in Central Asia with the obvious complicity of the British entrenched in India, who, having brought Afghanistan completely under their sway, long ago created a base for extending their colonial possessions, strangling nations, and attacking Soviet Russia. And now, when these separate links have become quite clear to us, the present military and general strategic position of our Republic has been fully revealed. Murmansk in the North, the Czechoslovak front in the East, Turkestan, Baku and Astrakhan in the South-East—we see that practically all the links in the chain forged by British and French imperialism have been joined.

We now clearly see that the landowners, the capitalists and the kulaks, all of whom, of course, for perfectly natural reasons have a burning hatred for the Soviet government, are acting here, too, in ways greatly resembling those

of the landowners, capitalists and kulaks in the Ukraine and in other regions severed from Russia. As the lackeys of British and French imperialism, they have done their utmost to undermine the Soviet government at all costs. Realising they could not do it with forces inside Russia alone, they decided to act not by words or appeals in the spirit of the Martov gentry, but by resorting to more effective methods of struggle—military hostilities. That is where our attention should be chiefly directed; that is where we should concentrate all our agitation and propaganda; and we should shift the centre of the whole of our Soviet work accordingly.

The fundamental fact is that it is the imperialist forces of the other coalition that are now at work, not the German, but the Anglo-French, which have seized part of our territory and are using it as a base. Up to now their geographical position has prevented them from attacking Russia by the direct route; now British and French imperialism, which for four years has been drenching the whole world in blood in a bid for world supremacy, has by an indirect route approached within easy reach of Russia, with the object of strangling the Soviet Republic and once more plunging Russia into imperialist war. You are all perfectly aware, comrades, that from the very beginning of the October Revolution our chief aim has been to put a stop to the imperialist war; but we never harboured the illusion that the forces of the proletariat and the revolutionary people of any one country, however heroic and however organised and disciplined they might be, could overthrow international imperialism. That can be done only by the joint efforts of the workers of the world.

What we have done, however, is to sever all connections with the capitalists of the whole world in one country. Our government is not tied by a single thread to any kind of imperialist and never will be, whatever future course our revolution may take. The revolutionary movement against imperialism during the eight months of our rule has made tremendous strides, and in one of the chief centres of imperialism, Germany, matters in January 1918 came to an armed clash and the bloody suppression of that movement. We have done our revolutionary duty as no revolutionary

government in any country has ever done on an international, world-wide scale. But we never deceived ourselves into thinking this could be done by the efforts of one country alone. We knew that our efforts were inevitably leading to a world-wide revolution, and that the war begun by the imperialist governments could not be stopped by the efforts of those governments themselves. It can be stopped only by the efforts of all workers; and when we came to power, our task as the proletarian Communist Party, at a time when capitalist bourgeois rule still remained in the other countries—our immediate task, I repeat, was to retain that power, that torch of socialism, so that it might scatter as many sparks as possible to add to the growing flames of socialist revolution.

This was everywhere an extremely difficult task; and what enabled us to accomplish it was the fact that the proletariat rallied to the defence of the gains of the Socialist Republic. This task has led to a particularly arduous and critical situation, for the socialist revolution, in the direct sense of the term, has not yet begun in any country, although it is more imminent in countries like Italy and Austria. But as it has not yet begun, we are faced with a new success to British and French, and therefore world, imperialism. Whereas from the West, German imperialism continues to stand as a military, annexatory, imperialist force, from the North-East and South of Russia, British and French imperialism has been able to dig itself in and is making it patently obvious to us that this force is prepared once more to plunge Russia into imperialist war, is prepared to crush Russia, the independent socialist state that is continuing its socialist work and propaganda on a scale hitherto unparalleled anywhere in the world. Against this, British and French imperialism has won a big victory, and, surrounding us on all sides, it is doing its utmost to crush Soviet Russia. We are fully aware that British and French imperialism's victory is inseparably connected with the class struggle.

We have always said—and revolutions bear it out—that when the foundations of the exploiters' economic power are at stake, their property, which places the labour of tens of millions of workers and peasants at their disposal and

enables the landowners and capitalists to enrich themselves, when, I repeat, the private property of the capitalists and landowners is at stake, they forget all talk about love for one's country and independence. We know full well that the Cadets, the Right Socialist-Revolutionaries and the Mensheviks have beaten the record in concluding alliances with the imperialist powers, in concluding predatory treaties and betraying the country to Anglo-French imperialism. The Ukraine and Tiflis are good examples. The alliance of the Mensheviks and Right Socialist-Revolutionaries with the Czechs is sufficient proof of this. And the action of the Left Socialist-Revolutionaries, when they tried to embroil the Russian Republic in war in the interests of the Yaroslavl whiteguards,⁸ shows quite clearly that when their class profits are at stake, the bourgeoisie will sell their country and strike a bargain with any foreigner against their own people. This truth has time and again been borne out by the history of the Russian revolution, after the history of revolution over a hundred years had shown that that is the law of the class interests, of the class policy of the bourgeoisie, at all times and in all countries. It is therefore by no means surprising that the present aggravation of the Soviet Republic's international position is connected with the aggravation of the class struggle at home.

We have often said that, in this respect, in regard to the aggravation of the food crisis, the period until the new harvest will be the most difficult. Russia is being flayed with the scourge of famine, which has attained unparalleled proportions precisely because it is the plan of the imperialist robbers to cut off her granaries. Their calculations are well founded and are aimed at getting social and class support in the grain-producing outlying regions; they seek areas where the kulaks predominate—the rich peasants, who have battened on the war and who live by the labour of others, the labour of the poor. You know that these people have piled up hundreds of thousands of rubles and that they have huge stocks of grain. You know that it is these people who have battened on national misfortunes and who had greater opportunity to rob and increase their profits the more the population of the capital suffered—it is

these kulaks who have constituted the chief and most formidable buttress of the counter-revolutionary movement in Russia. Here the class struggle has reached its deepest source. There is not a village left where the class struggle is not raging between a miserable handful of kulaks on the one hand and the vast labouring majority—the poor and those middle peasants who have no grain surpluses, who have consumed them long ago, and who did not go in for profiteering—on the other. This class struggle has penetrated every village.

When we were determining our political plans and publishing our decrees—the vast majority of those present here are, of course, familiar with them—when, I repeat, we drafted and passed the decrees on the organisation of the poor peasants,⁹ it was clear to us we were coming up against the most decisive and fundamental issue of the whole revolution, the most decisive and fundamental issue, the issue of power—whether power would remain in the hands of the workers; whether they could gain the support of all the poor peasants, with whom they have no differences; whether they would succeed in winning over the peasants with whom they have no disagreement, and unite this whole mass, which is dispersed, disunited and scattered through the villages—in which respect it lags behind the urban workers; whether they could unite them against the other camp, the camp of the landowners, the imperialists and kulaks.

Before our very eyes the poor peasants have begun to rally together very quickly. It is said that revolution teaches. The class struggle does indeed teach in practice that any false note in the position of any party immediately lands that party where it deserves to be. We have clearly seen the policy of the Left Socialist-Revolutionary Party, who, because of their spinelessness and stupidity, started to vacillate at a time when the food problem was at its height, and that party disappeared from the scene as a party and became a pawn in the hands of the Yaroslavl whiteguards. (*Applause.*)

Comrades, the wave of revolts sweeping Russia is easy to understand in the light of this sharpening of the class struggle over the food crisis at the very time when we know

the new harvest is a bumper one but cannot yet be gathered, and when the hunger-tormented people of Petrograd and Moscow are being driven to revolt by the kulaks and the bourgeoisie, who are making the most desperate efforts, crying "Now or never!" There is the revolt in Yaroslavl. And we can see the influence of the British and French; we see the calculations of the counter-revolutionary landowners and bourgeoisie. Wherever the question of grain arose, they obstructed the grain monopoly, without which there can be no socialism. That is just where the bourgeoisie are bound to unite; here the bourgeoisie have a stronger backing than the country yokel. The decisive fight between the forces of socialism and bourgeois society is bound to come in any case, whatever happens, if not today, then tomorrow, on one issue or another. Only pseudo-socialists, like our Left Socialist-Revolutionaries, for example, can waver. When socialists waver over this question, over this fundamental question, it means they are only pseudo-socialists, and are not worth a brass farthing. The effect of the revolution has virtually been to turn such socialists into mere pawns in the hands of the French generals, pawns whose role was demonstrated by the former Central Committee of the former Left Socialist-Revolutionary Party.

Comrades, the result of these combined efforts of the counter-revolutionary Russian bourgeoisie and the British and French imperialists has been that the Civil War in our country is now coming from a quarter which not all of us anticipated and from which not all of us clearly realised it might come, and it has merged with the war from without into one indivisible whole. The kulak revolt, the Czechoslovak mutiny and the Murmansk movement are all part of one and the same war that is bearing down on Russia. We escaped from war in one quarter by incurring tremendous losses and signing an incredibly harsh peace treaty; we knew we were concluding a predatory peace,¹⁰ but we said we would be able to continue our propaganda and our constructive work, and in that way cause the imperialist world's disintegration. We have succeeded in doing so. Germany is now negotiating with us as to how many thousand millions to extort from Russia on the basis of the

Brest-Litovsk Peace Treaty, but she has recognised all the acts of nationalisation we proclaimed under the decree of June 28.¹¹ She has not raised the question of private ownership of land in the Republic; this point must be stressed as a counterblast to the fantastic lies spread by Spiridonova and similar leaders of the Left Socialist-Revolutionaries, lies that have brought grist to the mill of the landowners and are now being repeated by the most ignorant and backward Black-Hundred¹² elements. These lies must be nailed.

The fact of the matter is that, burdensome as the peace treaty may be, we have won freedom to carry on socialist construction at home, and have taken steps in this direction which are now becoming known in Western Europe and constitute elements of propaganda that are incomparably more effective than any before.

So, having got out of war in one quarter, with one coalition, we have been at once subjected to an imperialist assault from another quarter. Imperialism is a world-wide phenomenon; it is a struggle for the division of the whole world, of the whole earth, for the domination of one or another group of robbers. Now another group of vultures, the Anglo-French, are hurling themselves at our throats and threatening to drag us into war again. Their war is merging with the Civil War into one continuous whole, and that is the chief source of our difficulties at present, when the question of war, of military hostilities, has again come to the fore as the cardinal and fundamental question of the revolution. There lies the whole difficulty, for the people are tired of war, exhausted by it as never before. The Russian people's state of extreme war fatigue and exhaustion is rather like that of a man who has been thrashed within an inch of his life, and who cannot be expected to show any energy or working capacity. And in the same way this nearly four years' war, overwhelming a country which had been despoiled, tormented, and defiled by tsarism, by the autocracy, the bourgeoisie and Kerensky, has for many reasons naturally aroused a feeling of abhorrence in the Russian people, and is one of the chief sources of the tremendous difficulties we are now experiencing.

Yet such a turn of events definitely made for war. We have again been plunged into war, we are in a state of war; and it is not only civil war, war against the kulaks, the landowners and the capitalists who have united against us—now we are faced with British and French imperialism. The imperialists are still not in a position to throw their armies against Russia—they are prevented by geographical conditions; but they are devoting all they can, all their millions, all their diplomatic connections and forces, to aid our enemies. We are in a state of war, and we can emerge triumphant. But here we come up against a formidable enemy, one of the most difficult to cope with—war-weariness, hatred and abhorrence of war; and this must be overcome, otherwise we shall not be able to tackle this problem—the problem of war—which does not depend on our will. Our country has again been plunged into war, and the outcome of the revolution will now entirely depend on who is the victor. The principal protagonists are the Czechs, but the real directors, the real motive and actuating power are the British and French imperialists. The whole question of the existence of the Russian Socialist Federative Soviet Republic, the whole question of the Russian socialist revolution has been reduced to a question of war. There lie tremendous difficulties, considering the state in which the people have emerged from the imperialist war. Our task is now perfectly clear. Any deceit would be tremendously harmful; we consider it a crime to conceal this bitter truth from the workers and peasants. On the contrary, let the truth be brought home to them all as clearly and graphically as possible.

Yes, there have been cases when our troops displayed criminal weakness, as, for example, during the capture of Simbirsk by the Czechs, when our forces retreated. We know the troops are tired of war and loathe it; but it is also natural and inevitable that until imperialism is defeated internationally, it should attempt to drag Russia into imperialist war, endeavour to make a shambles of her. Whether we like it or not, the question stands as follows: we are in a war, and on the outcome of that war hangs the fate of the revolution. That should be the first and last word in our

propaganda work, in all our political, revolutionary, and construction activities. We have done very much in a short time, but the job is not yet over. All our activities must be entirely and completely geared to this question, on which the fate and outcome of the revolution, the fate of the Russian and world revolution now depends. Of course, world imperialism cannot get out of the present war without a number of revolutions; this war cannot end otherwise than by the ultimate victory of socialism. But our task now is to maintain, protect and uphold this force of socialism, this torch of socialism, this source of socialism which is so actively influencing the whole world. And as matters now stand, this task is a military task.

This is not the first time we have been in such a situation, and many of us have said that however severe the price we had to pay for peace, however grave the sacrifices it demanded of us, however much the enemy was striving to rob us of more and more territory, Russia so far, in the face of great odds, was enjoying peace and in a position to consolidate her socialist gains. We have even gone farther in this direction than many of us expected. For example, our workers' control has advanced a long way from its early forms, and today we are about to witness the conversion of the state administration into a socialist system. We have made great strides in our practical affairs. We now have the workers completely running industry. But circumstances have prevented us from continuing that work in peace; they have once again plunged us into war, and we must strain every nerve and summon everyone to arms. It would be a disgrace for any Communist to be in two minds over this.

Vacillation among the peasants does not surprise us. The peasants have not been through the same school of life as the workers, who have been accustomed for decades to look upon the capitalist as their class enemy, and who have learned to unite their forces to combat him. We know the peasants have not been through such a university. At one time they sided with the workers but today we are witnessing a period of vacillation, when the peasants are splitting up. We know any number of instances of kulaks

selling grain to the peasants below the fixed prices in order to create the impression that they, the kulaks, are defending the peasants' interests. None of this surprises us. But the Communist worker will not waver, the working class will stand firm; and if a kulak spirit prevails among the peasants, it is quite understandable. Where the Czechs rule and the Bolsheviks no longer are, we have the following picture: at first the Czechs are hailed practically as deliverers; but after a few weeks of this bourgeois rule, a tremendous movement against the Czechs and in favour of the Soviet government arises, because the peasants begin to realise that all talk about freedom of trade and a Constituent Assembly means only one thing—the rule of the landowners and capitalists.

Our job is to get the workers to rally and to create an organisation under which within the next few weeks everything will be devoted to solving the war issue. We are now at war with British and French imperialism and with everything bourgeois and capitalist in Russia, with everyone endeavouring to frustrate the socialist revolution and embroil us in war. The situation is one where all the gains of the workers and peasants are at stake. We may be confident that we shall have the broad sympathy and support of the proletariat, and then the danger will be completely averted, and new ranks of the proletariat will come forward to stand up for their class and save the socialist revolution. As matters now stand, the struggle is being fought over two major issues, and all the main party differences have been obliterated in the fires of revolution. The Left Socialist-Revolutionary who keeps insistently reminding us that he is on the left, concealing himself behind a cloud of revolutionary phrases, while actually revolting against the Soviet government, is just the same a hireling of the Yaroslavl whiteguards. That is what he is in history and the revolutionary struggle! Today only two classes confront each other in the battle arena: the class struggle is between the proletariat, which is protecting the interests of the working people, and those protecting the interests of the landowners and capitalists. All talk about a Constituent Assembly, about an independent state and so on, which is being used to dupe the ignorant masses, has been exposed by the exper-

ience of the Czech and Caucasian Menshevik movements. Behind all this talk stand the same forces—the land-owners and capitalists; and the Czech mutiny brings in its train the rule of the landowners and capitalists, just as the German occupation does. That is what the war is about!

Comrades, the workers must close their ranks more firmly than ever and set an example of organisation and discipline in this struggle. Russia is still the only country which has severed all ties with the imperialists. True, we are bleeding from grave wounds. We have retreated in the face of the imperialist brute, playing for time, striking a blow at it here and there. But, as the Socialist Soviet Republic, we have remained independent. Performing our socialist work, we opposed the imperialism of the whole world; and this struggle is becoming clearer and clearer to the workers of the world, and their mounting indignation is bringing them nearer and nearer to the future revolution. It is over this that the struggle is being waged, because our Republic is the only country in the world not to march hand in hand with imperialism and not to allow millions of people to be slaughtered to decide whether the French or the Germans will rule the world. Our Republic is the only country to have broken away by force, by revolutionary means, from the world imperialist war, and to have raised the banner of socialist revolution. But it is being dragged back into the imperialist war, and being forced into the trenches. Let the Czechs fight the Germans, let the Russian bourgeoisie make their choice, let Milyukov decide, perhaps even in concurrence with Spiridonova and Kamkov, which imperialists to side with. But we declare we must be prepared to lay down our lives to prevent them deciding this question, for the salvation of the whole socialist revolution is at stake. (*Applause.*) I know there is a change of spirit among the peasants of the Saratov, Samara, and Simbirsk gubernias, where fatigue was most marked and fitness for military action was lowest of all. After experiencing the ravages of the Cossacks and Czechs, and having a real taste of what the Constituent Assembly and the cries "Down with the Brest Peace Treaty!" mean, they have realised that all this only leads to the return of the landowner,

to the capitalist mounting the throne—and they are now becoming the most ardent champions of Soviet power. I have not the slightest doubt that the Petrograd and Moscow workers, who are marching at the head of the revolution, will understand the situation, will understand the gravity of the times and will act with greater determination than ever, and that the proletariat will smash both the Anglo-French and the Czech offensive in the interests of the socialist revolution. (*Applause.*)

Published in 1919 in the book
*All-Russia Central Executive
Committee, Fifth Convocation.
Verbatim Report, Moscow*

Published according to
the text of the book checked
with the verbatim report

SPEECH AT A CONGRESS OF
CHAIRMEN OF GUBERNIA SOVIETS¹³
JULY 30, 1918
NEWSPAPER REPORT

Comrades, your job is one of administration, which plays a dominant part in the affairs of the Council of People's Commissars. Quite naturally, many difficulties lie ahead of you. In the majority of gubernia Executive Committees it is evident that the masses are at last beginning to tackle the work of administration themselves. There are certainly bound to be difficulties. One of our greatest shortcomings has been that we still draw too little on the workers for our staffs. But it was never our intention to adapt the old apparatus to the new system of administration, and we do not regret that with the abolition of the old apparatus everything has to be built anew with so much difficulty. The workers and peasants possess greater constructive abilities than might have been expected. It is to the revolution's credit that it swept away the old administrative apparatus. Yet at the same time we must admit that the people's chief shortcoming is their timidity and reluctance to take things into their own hands.

Some of our gubernia Soviets have been inefficient, but now the work is steadily improving. Information has been coming in from many parts of the country stating that the work is progressing without any misunderstandings or conflicts. Although only eight months have elapsed, the Russian revolution has proved that the new class which has taken administration into its own hands is capable of coping with the task. Although it is short-staffed, the administrative apparatus is running more smoothly every day.

Our apparatus is still at a stage where no definite results are visible, a fact which the enemy keeps harping on. Nevertheless, quite a lot has already been done. The transfer of land and industry to the working people, the exchange of goods and the organisation of food supply are being carried into effect in face of fantastic difficulties. The working people must be promoted to independent work in building up and running the socialist state. Only practice will teach them that the old exploiting class is finished and done with.

Our chief and most urgent task is administration, organisation and control. This is a thankless and inconspicuous job; but it is in doing this job that the managerial and administrative talents of the workers and peasants will develop more and more effectively.

Now to the new Constitution.¹⁴ It embodies what experience has already given, and will be corrected and supplemented as it is being put into effect. The main thing about the Constitution is that the Soviet government is completely dissociating itself from the bourgeoisie, preventing them from participating in building up the state.

The workers and peasants, upon whom the government has called to run the country, and who have remained remote from such affairs for so long, were bound to want to build the state by their own experience. The effect of the slogan "All Power to the Soviets!" was that the people in the localities wanted to gain experience in building the state by learning from their own mistakes. Such a transitional period was unavoidable, and it has proved beneficial. In this tendency towards separatism, there was much that was healthy and wholesome in the sense that it displayed a creative spirit. The Soviet Constitution has defined the relations between the volost authority and the uyezd authority, between the uyezd authority and the gubernia authority, and between the latter and the centre.

Only large-scale, planned construction, which aims at evenly utilising economic and business values, deserves to be called socialist. The Soviet government certainly does not intend to belittle the importance of the local authorities or kill their autonomy and initiative. Even the peasants realise through their own experience the need for centralism.

Now that the Constitution has been endorsed and is being put into effect, an easier period in our state affairs is beginning. But, unfortunately, it is hard for us just now to devote ourselves to an economic, business and agricultural policy. We have to divert all our attention to more elementary things—the food question. The condition of the working class in the hungry provinces is really drastic. Until the new harvest is brought in, every effort must be made to overcome somehow the food difficulties and other troubles.

Besides this, there are military tasks. You know that the Czech movement, financed and instigated by the British and French imperialists, has caught Russia in a semicircle. You also know that the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie and the kulak peasants are joining this movement. We have received news from the localities that Soviet Russia's recent reverses have convinced the workers and the revolutionary peasants by their own experience that control is needed in the military sphere as well as in state development.

I am convinced that things will get better in future. I am convinced that the gubernia Executive Committees will create a strong socialist army by organising control over the commanding staff with the help of the peasants. The lessons of the revolution have at last taught the classes of the workers and exploited peasants the need to take up arms. The peasants and workers, besides having won the land, control, etc., have learnt to understand the need to control the army. By carrying their efforts into the sphere of military affairs, they will make the army of their creation fully worthy of the title of a socialist army, an army which will successfully fight the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie and the imperialists until the international revolutionary proletariat comes to our aid. (*Comrade Lenin's speech is greeted with stormy applause from all delegates.*)

SPEECH AT A MEETING OF
THE WARSAW REVOLUTIONARY REGIMENT
AUGUST 2, 1918 ¹⁸
NEWSPAPER REPORT

(Comrade Lenin's appearance in the hall is greeted with enthusiastic applause and the "Internationale".) We Polish and Russian revolutionaries are now burning with one desire—to do everything to defend the gains of the first mighty socialist revolution, which will inevitably be followed by a series of revolutions in other countries. Our difficulty is that we had to take action much earlier than the workers of the more cultured, more civilised countries.

The world war was caused by the forces of international capital, of two coalitions of vultures. For four years the world has been drenched in blood in order to settle which of these two rapacious imperialist groups shall rule the globe. We feel and sense that this criminal war cannot end in victory for either of them. It is becoming clearer every day that a victorious workers' revolution, not the imperialists, can end it. And the worse the position of the workers now becomes in all countries, and the more ferociously proletarian free speech is persecuted, the more desperate the bourgeoisie get, for they cannot cope with the growing movement. We have for a time forged ahead of the main body of the socialist army, which is full of hope as it watches us and says to its bourgeoisie: however much you rant and rage, we shall follow the Russian example and do what the Russian Bolsheviks have done.

We wanted peace. It was just because Soviet Russia proposed peace to the whole world that in February German troops attacked us. Now, however, we see with our own eyes

that one imperialism is no better than the other. Both of them have lied, and lie now when they say they are waging a war of liberation. Anglo-French capital is showing itself up just as robber Germany once did with the utterly shameful Brest Peace. The British and French are now making their last bid to draw us into the war. For fifteen million, through generals and other officers, they have now bought new lackeys, the Czechs, so as to involve them in the rash adventure and turn the Czechoslovak revolt into a white-guard-landlord movement. And strange to say, all this is apparently being done to "defend" Russia. The "freedom-loving" and "fair" British oppress all and sundry, seize Murmansk, British cruisers come right up to Archangel and bombard the coastal batteries—all to "defend" Russia. Quite obviously they want to encircle Russia in a ring of imperialist plunderers and crush her for having exposed and torn up their secret treaties.

Our revolution has resulted in the workers of Britain and France indicting their governments. In Britain, where civil peace has prevailed and where the workers' resistance to socialism has been strongest, for they too have had a hand in plundering the colonies, the workers are now veering round and breaking the civil peace with the bourgeoisie.

The workers of France are condemning the policy of intervention in Russia's affairs. That is why the capitalists of these countries are staking everything they have.

The fact of Soviet Russia's existence and vitality is driving them mad.

We know the war is coming to an end; we know they cannot finish it; we know we have a reliable ally. We must therefore exert all our energy and make a last effort. Either the rule of the proletariat or the rule of the kulaks, capitalists and the tsar, as was the case in the unsuccessful revolutions in the West. As you go to the front you must remember above all that this war alone, the war of the oppressed and exploited against the violators and plunderers, is legitimate, just and sacred.

An alliance is coming into being between the revolutionaries of different nations—something that the finest people have dreamt of; a real alliance of workers, and not intellectual dreamers.

The guarantee of victory lies in overcoming national hatred and mistrust.

It is your great privilege to uphold sacred ideas arms in hand, and to make international brotherhood of nations a reality by fighting together with your front-line enemies of yesterday—Germans, Austrians and Magyars.

And, comrades, I am confident that if you muster all your military forces and set up a mighty international Red Army, and hurl these iron battalions against the exploiters and oppressors, against the reactionary thugs of the whole world, making your battle cry "Victory or Death!"—no imperialist force will be able to hold us! (*Lenin's concluding words are drowned in prolonged and stormy applause.*)

Published in *Vechernye Izvestia*
Moskovskogo Sovetu No. 15,
August 3, 1918

Published according to
the newspaper text

SPEECH AT A MEETING IN BUTYRSKY DISTRICT
AUGUST 2, 1918
NEWSPAPER REPORT

Comrades, today socialist Russia's destiny is being discussed all over Moscow.¹⁶

The enemies of Soviet Russia surround us in a tight ring of iron to try to deprive the workers and peasants of everything they gained from the October Revolution. The high-flying banner of the Russian social revolution is a thorn in the side of the imperialist vultures and they have gone to war against us, gone to war against the Soviet government, against the workers' and peasants' government.

You will remember, comrades, that at the beginning of the revolution the French and British never tired of insisting they were the "allies" of free Russia. And here we have these "allies" today in their true colours. By lies and deceit, saying they had no intention of fighting Russia, these people occupied Murmansk, then captured Kem and began to shoot our comrades, members of the Soviets. True enough, they are not fighting the Russian bourgeoisie, they are not fighting the Russian capitalists, they have declared war on the Soviets, they have declared war on the workers and peasants.

The French and Russian bourgeoisie have found ready accomplices in the Czechs. These mercenaries had reason to fight us. We know whose millions induced the Czechs to go to war against the Soviet government. It was Anglo-French gold. But besides the Czechs, there are other people who did not think twice about bringing down the Soviet government. Like the Czechs, our own "saviours of the fatherland", Dutov, Alexeyev and the rest, are lining their pockets

with British and French gold and waiting for a Russian shower of gold. The Soviet government has a lot of enemies. But are we alone, comrades?

You will recall what it was like in January, when the flame of social revolution had just been lit—there had been a mass strike movement in Germany; now, eight months later, we see mass strike movements in various countries: there is a mass strike movement among the Austrian workers, our comrades in Italy are on strike. The end is near for the oppressors of the workers. The imperialists of the world are digging their own graves.

War for mutual plunder does not abate. Two serpents are grappling in the war of plunder: Anglo-French and German imperialism. To please them, for one side's triumph, ten million peasants and workers have already been killed and twenty million maimed, and many millions of people are engaged in manufacturing weapons of death. In every country the strongest and healthiest people are being called up, the flower of humanity is perishing.... And for what? Just for one of these vultures to lord it over the other....

The Soviet government said we do not want to fight the Germans, the British or the French. We do not want to kill workers and peasants like ourselves. They are not our enemies. We have a different enemy—the bourgeoisie, whether it be the German, the French, or the Russian who have now joined up with the British and French.

And, like our revolutionary banner, our slogans are being taken up all over the world. In America, the country that used to be called the land of the free, socialists are filling the gaols to overflowing. In Germany, the words of the German socialist Friedrich Adler are being spread far and wide among the workers and soldiers: "Turn your bayonets on your own bourgeoisie instead of on the Russian workers and peasants." There is no end in sight to the slaughter started by the capitalists. The more Germany wins, the more the savages like her who tag on to the other side. America, too, is now fighting together with the British and French. Only the workers can put an end to the war: world revolution is inevitable. A "defeatist" movement like the one we had has already begun in Germany, mass strikes are taking place in Italy and Austria, and socialists are being arrested whole-

sale in America. Sensing their doom, the capitalists and landowners are making a last effort to crush the revolutionary movement. The Russian capitalists are stretching out a hand to the British and French capitalists and land-owners.

Now there are two fronts: the workers and peasants on one side, and the capitalists on the other. The last, decisive battle is near. Now there can be no compromise with the bourgeoisie. Either them or us.

In 1871, the bourgeoisie overthrew the power of the Paris workers. But in those days there were very few class-conscious workers or revolutionary fighters. This time the workers are backed by the poor peasants and this time the bourgeoisie will not triumph as they did in 1871.

The workers are keeping a firm grip on the mills and factories, and the peasants will not surrender the land to the landowners. And in defence of these achievements we also declare war on all marauders and profiteers. Besides machine-guns and cannons, they are threatening us with famine.

As we declare war on the rich, we say: "Peace to the cottages!" We shall take all the stocks from the profiteers and never abandon the labouring poor to the mercy of fate.
(*Comrade Lenin's speech is greeted with stormy applause.*)

Brief report published
August 3, 1918
in *Izvestia* No. 164

Published according to the
text in the newspaper
Soldat Revolusii (Tsaritsyn)
No. 14, August 23, 1918

SPEECH AT A RALLY
OF RED ARMY MEN AT KHODYNKA
AUGUST 2, 1918
BRIEF NEWSPAPER REPORT

(*Enthusiastic applause.*) The Russian revolution has charted the road to socialism for the whole world and has shown the bourgeoisie that their triumph is coming to an end. Our revolution is taking place amidst the frightful hardships of world slaughter.

Revolutions are not made to order; but there are sure signs that the whole world is ready for great events.

We are surrounded by enemies who have concluded a holy alliance for the overthrow of the Soviet government, but they will not get power themselves.

The rejoicing of the whiteguard bands is premature—their success will be short-lived; unrest is already spreading among them.

The Red Army reinforced by the revolutionary proletariat will help us raise on high the banner of the world socialist revolution.

Victory or death!

We shall vanquish the world kulak and uphold the socialist cause!

THESES ON THE FOOD QUESTION¹⁷

FOR THE COMMISSARIATS OF FOOD, AGRICULTURE,
THE SUPREME ECONOMIC COUNCIL, FINANCE, TRADE
AND INDUSTRY

I propose that these Commissariats hurry to debate and formulate the following measures no later than today (August 2) so that they can be put through the Council of People's Commissars today or tomorrow.

(Some of these measures should be in decrees, others in unpublished decisions.)

(1) Out of the two schemes—lowering prices on manufactured and other goods or raising the purchasing price of grain—we must certainly choose the latter for, though the two are essentially the same, only the latter can help us in quickly getting more grain from a number of grain-growing provinces like Simbirsk, Saratov, Voronezh, etc., and help us neutralise as many peasants as possible in the Civil War.

(2) I suggest raising the grain prices to 30 rubles a pood, and correspondingly (and even more) to raise prices on manufactured and other goods.

(3) I suggest for discussion: whether to make this a temporary rise (so that we can sum up the practical indications as to the correct principle on which our trade exchange should be organised), say, for a month or month and a half, promising to *lower prices* afterwards (thereby offering bonuses for quick collection).

(4) To enact several very urgent measures for *requisitioning* all the products of urban industry for exchange (and put up their prices after requisitioning to a *greater extent* than the rise in grain prices).

(5) To preface the decree on grain price rise with a popular elucidation of the measure connected with the trade exchange and the establishment of the correct correlation between the prices of grain, manufactured and other goods.

(6) The decree should immediately compel the co-operatives a) to set up a grain-collection point in each village shop; b) to give goods *only* according to the customers' ration books; c) *not* to give a *single* item to peasant-farmers except in exchange for grain.

To establish forms and means of control over the implementation of these measures and introduce stern punishment (confiscation of all property) for their violation.

(7) To confirm (or to formulate more precisely) the rules and regulations concerning property confiscation for *not handing over* to the state (*or the co-operatives*) grain surpluses and *all other* food products for registration.

(8) To impose a tax *in kind*, in grain, on the rich peasants. This category should include those whose amount of grain (including the new harvest) is double or more than double their own consumption (taking into account needs for their family, livestock and sowing).

This is to be designated as an *income* and property tax and made progressive.

(9) To establish for *workers* of the hungry regions temporarily, let's say for one month, preferential carriage of 1.5 poods of grain on condition of special certificate and special control.

The certificate must contain the exact address and authority a) from a factory committee; b) from a house committee; c) from a trade union; and control must establish that it is for *personal* consumption, with a very severe penalty to anyone who cannot prove the impossibility of its reselling.

(10) To make it a rule to issue a receipt, two or three copies, for literally *every* requisition (particularly in the countryside and on the railway). To print forms of the receipt. Shooting to be the penalty for not giving a receipt.

(11) To enforce the same penalty for members of all kinds of requisitioning, food and other teams for any blatantly unjust action towards the working people or any infringement of the rules and regulations or actions liable

to rouse the indignation of the population, as well as for failure to keep a record and to hand over a copy to anyone who has already suffered requisitioning or punishment.

(12) To make it a rule that the workers and poor peasants in the hungry regions should have the right to have a goods train delivered to *their* station directly, under certain conditions: a) authorisation of local organisations (Soviet of Deputies plus the trade union without fail and others); b) making up a *responsible* team; c) inclusion in it of teams from other regions; d) participation of an inspector and Commissar from the Food, War, Transport and other Commissariats; e) their control of the train load and the distribution of grain. They must see that a *compulsory* part (a third to a half or more) goes to the Food Commissariat.

(13) As an exception, in view of the acute hunger among some railway *workers* and the particular importance of railways for grain delivery, to establish temporarily that:

requisitioning or anti-profiteering teams, in requisitioning the grain, shall issue receipts to those from whom it has been taken, and put the grain into the goods waggons and dispatch these waggons to the *Central Food Bureau*, while observing the following forms of control: a) sending a telegram to the Food and Transport Commissariats notifying them about each goods waggon; b) summoning officials from both Commissariats to meet the goods waggon and distribute the grain under the Food Commissariat's supervision.

Written August 2, 1918

Published according to
the manuscript

ADMISSION TO HIGHER EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION

DRAFT DECISION OF THE COUNCIL OF PEOPLE'S COMMISSARS¹⁸

The Council of People's Commissars instructs the Commissariat of Education at once to prepare several decisions and measures so that in the event of the number of applicants to the higher educational institutions exceeding the usual number of places, extra-special measures be taken to ensure a chance to study for all who so desire, and to ensure there be no actual or legal privileges for the propertied classes. Priority must certainly go to workers and poor peasants, who are to be given grants on an extensive scale.

Written August 2, 1918

Published August 6, 1918
in *Izvestia* No. 166

Published according to
the manuscript

LETTER TO YELETS WORKERS¹⁰

I have received a clipping from a Yelets newspaper containing a report of a special meeting of the Yelets branch of the Left Socialist-Revolutionary Party held on July 27. I see from it that Mochenov reported on the Saratov conference of the Socialist-Revolutionaries, where eight branches approved their Central Committee's tactics which had been defended by Mr. Kolegayev, while thirteen branches demanded the party's reorganisation and a change of tactics.

I note that at the Yelets meeting Comrade Rudakov insisted that "our party [the Left Socialist-Revolutionaries] be reorganised" and its name changed, that it be purged and that under no circumstances should it be allowed to fall apart and disappear. A certain Kryukov then alleged that he had spoken to representatives of the central government in Moscow and that Comrades Avanesov, Sverdlov and Bonch-Bruyevich had declared that the Soviet government favoured the existence of the Left Socialist-Revolutionary Party. He also alleged that in a conversation with him I had said the same thing and had stated that the Communists too had come so far from their former theories, from their books, that they had no programme at all at present, while in their policies a great deal was being indirectly borrowed from Narodnik theory, and so on and so forth.

I consider it my duty to say this is pure fiction and that I have never spoken to this Kryukov. I earnestly request our comrades, the workers and peasants of the Yelets Uyezd, to be extremely wary of the Left Socialist-Revolutionaries, who all too frequently tell lies.

A few words about my view of them. Types like Kolegayev and the others are certainly just pawns in the hands

of the whiteguards, the monarchists and the Savinkovs, who in Yaroslavl showed who was "profiting" by the Left Socialist-Revolutionary revolt. Their stupidity and spinelessness brought Kolegayev and his friends to this degradation, and good riddance! They will go down in history as "Savinkov lackeys". But the facts show that among the Left Socialist-Revolutionaries there are people (and in Saratov they are in the majority) who were ashamed of this stupidity and spinelessness, of this servility to monarchism and the interests of the landowners. We can only welcome it if these people desire to change even their party's name (I have heard they want to call themselves "Village-Commune Communists" or "Narodnik Communists", etc.).

The pure ideological basis of this Narodism, an alliance with which the Bolshevik Communists have never rejected, is, firstly, disagreement with Marxism, and, secondly, complete agreement with the theory of "equal land tenure" (and with the law of equal land tenure).

We favour such an alliance, an agreement with the middle peasants, for we worker Communists have no grounds for quarrelling with the middle peasants and are prepared to make them a number of concessions. We have proved this, and proved it in deed, because we have been carrying out the law on the socialisation of land with absolutely good faith, despite the fact that we do not entirely agree with it.¹⁰ Generally, we have been and are in favour of ruthless war on the kulaks, but we favour an agreement with the middle peasants and union with the poor peasants. An agreement with the middle peasants must not be construed as necessarily implying agreement with the Left Socialist-Revolutionaries. Nothing of the kind.

We passed the socialisation law at a time when we had no agreement with the Left Socialist-Revolutionaries; and this law, in fact, is an expression of our agreement with the middle peasants, with the peasant masses, and not with the Left Socialist-Revolutionary petty intellectuals.

Comrade workers and peasants, don't seek an agreement with the Left Socialist-Revolutionaries, for we have seen and experienced their unreliability. Spread communism among the poor peasants; the majority will be on our side. Try to make concessions to the middle peasants. Treat them

as tactfully and as fairly as possible. We can and should make concessions to them. Be ruthless in your attitude towards the tiny handful of exploiters, including the kulaks and the grain profiteers, who are growing rich on the people's misfortunes and the starvation of the workers—towards the handful of kulaks who are sucking the blood of the working people.

V. Ulyanov (N. Lenin)

Moscow, August 6, 1918

Sovetskaya Gazeta (Yelets) No. 73,
August 11, 1918

Published according to
the newspaper text

SPEECH AT A MEETING
IN SOKOLNIKI DISTRICT
AUGUST 9, 1918²¹

BRIEF NEWSPAPER REPORT

(Prolonged applause.) The war is already in its fifth year, and by now everyone can see who wanted it. The rich have grown richer, and the poor are literally choking under the yoke of capitalism. This war has cost the poor people many a bloody sacrifice, and all they have received in return is hunger, unemployment and the noose drawn tighter than ever around their necks.

The war was started by the British and German vultures who found themselves too cramped living together, and so each of them decided to drown the other in the blood of the workers of the world. Each of these vultures assures us he is inspired by the people's interests, but in fact he is working in the interests of his own pocket.

Britain is plundering the German colonies she has seized, part of Palestine and Mesopotamia, while Germany, in turn, is plundering Poland, Courland, Lithuania and the Ukraine. The millionaires of these countries have grown ten times richer; but, all the same, they have miscalculated.

Locked in mortal combat, these vultures are on the edge of a precipice. They can no longer stop the war, which is inevitably driving the peoples to revolution.

The Russian revolution has cast sparks into every country of the world, and has pushed the imperialists, who have gone too far, nearer to the edge of the precipice.

Comrades, we are in a very difficult position, but we must overcome every difficulty and hold fast the banner of socialist revolution we have raised aloft.

The workers of the world are looking hopefully towards us. We can hear their cry: "Hold on a little longer! You are surrounded by enemies, but we shall come to your aid, and by our joint effort we shall finally hurl the imperialist vultures over the precipice."

We hear this cry, and we swear we shall hold on, we shall stick to our post fighting with all our strength and not lay down our arms in face of the onslaught of world counter-revolution!

Izvestia No. 171,
August 11, 1918

Published according to
the *Izvestia* text

COMRADE WORKERS, FORWARD TO THE LAST, DECISIVE FIGHT!

The Soviet Republic is surrounded by enemies. But it will defeat its enemies at home and abroad. A rising spirit which will ensure victory is already perceptible among the working people. We already see how frequent the sparks and explosions of the revolutionary conflagration in Western Europe have become, inspiring us with the assurance that the triumph of the world workers' revolution is not far off.

The external foe of the Russian Soviet Socialist Republic at present is British, French, American and Japanese imperialism. This foe is attacking Russia, is plundering our territory, has seized Archangel and (if the French newspapers are to be believed) has advanced from Vladivostok to Nikolsk-Ussuriisky. This foe has bribed the generals and officers of the Czechoslovak Corps. This enemy is attacking peaceful Russia with the ferocity and voracity of the Germans in February, the only difference being that the British and Japanese are out to seize and plunder Russian territory and to overthrow the Soviet government so as to "restore the front", i.e., to draw Russia again into the imperialist (or more simply, the predatory) war between Britain and Germany.

The British and Japanese capitalists want to restore the power of the landowners and capitalists in Russia in order to share with them the booty captured in the war; they want to shackle the Russian workers and peasants to British and French capital, to squeeze out of them interest on the billions advanced in loans, and to extinguish the fire of socialist revolution which has broken out in our country and which is threatening to spread across the world.

The British and Japanese imperialist savages are not strong enough to occupy and subjugate Russia. Even neighbouring Germany is not strong enough for that, as was shown by her "experience" in the Ukraine. The British and Japanese counted on taking us unawares. They failed. The Petrograd workers, followed by the Moscow workers, and after Moscow the workers of the entire central industrial region, are rising more unitedly, with growing persistence and courage and in ever larger numbers. That is a sure sign we shall win.

In launching their attack on peaceful Russia the British and Japanese capitalist robbers are also counting on alliance with the internal enemy of the Soviet government. We all know who that internal enemy is. It is the capitalists, the land-owners, the kulaks, and their offspring, who hate the government of the workers and working peasants—the peasants who do not suck the blood of their fellow-villagers.

A wave of kulak revolts is sweeping across Russia. The kulak hates the Soviet government like poison and is prepared to strangle and massacre hundreds of thousands of workers. We know very well that if the kulaks were to gain the upper hand they would ruthlessly slaughter hundreds of thousands of workers, in alliance with the landowners and capitalists, restore back-breaking conditions for the workers, abolish the eight-hour day and hand back the mills and factories to the capitalists.

That was the case in all earlier European revolutions when, as a result of the weakness of the workers, the kulaks succeeded in turning back from a republic to a monarchy, from a working people's government to the despotism of the exploiters, the rich and the parasites. This happened before our very eyes in Latvia, Finland, the Ukraine and Georgia. Everywhere the avaricious, bloated and bestial kulaks joined hands with the landowners and capitalists against the workers and against the poor generally. Everywhere the kulaks wreaked their vengeance on the working class with incredible ferocity. Everywhere they joined hands with the *foreign capitalists* against the workers of their own country. That is the way the Cadets, the Right Socialist-Revolutionaries and the Mensheviks have been acting: we have only to remember their exploits in "Czechoslovakia".²² That is the way the Left Socialist-Revolutionaries, in their crass stupidity,

and spinelessness, acted too when they revolted in Moscow, thus assisting the whiteguards in Yaroslavl and the Czechs and the Whites in Kazan. No wonder these Left Socialist-Revolutionaries were praised by Kerensky and his friends, the French imperialists.

There is no doubt about it. The kulaks are rabid foes of the Soviet government. Either the kulaks massacre vast numbers of workers, or the workers ruthlessly suppress the revolts of the predatory kulak minority of the people against the working people's government. There can be no middle course. Peace is out of the question: even if they have quarrelled, the kulak can easily come to terms with the landowner, the tsar and the priest, but with the working class *never*.

That is why we call the fight against the kulaks the *last*, decisive fight. That does not mean there may not be many more kulak revolts, or that there may not be many more attacks on the Soviet government by foreign capitalism. The words, the *last* fight, imply that the last and most numerous of the *exploiting* classes has revolted against us in our country.

The kulaks are the most brutal, callous and savage exploiters, who in the history of other countries have time and again restored the power of the landowners, tsars, priests and capitalists. The kulaks are more numerous than the landowners and capitalists. Nevertheless, they are a minority.

Let us take it that there are about fifteen million peasant families in Russia, taking Russia as she was before the robbers deprived her of the Ukraine and other territories. Of these fifteen million, probably ten million are poor peasants who live by selling their labour power, or who are in bondage to the rich, or who lack grain surpluses and have been most impoverished by the burdens of war. About three million must be regarded as middle peasants, while barely two million consist of kulaks, rich peasants, grain profiteers. These bloodsuckers have grown rich on the want suffered by the people in the war; they have raked in thousands and hundreds of thousands of rubles by pushing up the price of grain and other products. These spiders have grown fat at the expense of the peasants ruined by the war, at the expense of the starving workers. These leeches have sucked the

blood of the working people and grown richer as the workers in the cities and factories starved. These vampires have been gathering the landed estates into their hands; they continue to enslave the poor peasants.

Ruthless war on the kulaks! Death to them! Hatred and contempt for the parties which defend them—the Right Socialist-Revolutionaries, the Mensheviks, and today's Left Socialist-Revolutionaries! The workers must crush the revolts of the kulaks with an iron hand, the kulaks who are forming an alliance with the foreign capitalists against the working people of their own country.

The kulaks take advantage of the ignorance, the disunity and isolation of the poor peasants. They incite them against the workers. Sometimes they bribe them while permitting them to "make a bit", a hundred rubles or so, by profiteering in grain (at the same time robbing the poor peasants of many thousands of rubles). The kulaks try to win the support of the middle peasants, and they sometimes succeed.

But there is no reason why the working class should quarrel with the middle peasant. The workers cannot come to terms with the kulak, but they may seek, and are seeking, an *agreement* with the middle peasant. The workers' government, the Bolshevik government, *has proved* that in deed.

We proved it by passing the law on the "socialisation of land" and strictly carrying it into effect. That law contains numerous concessions to the interests and views of the middle peasant.

We proved it (the other day) by *trebling* grain prices²³; for we fully realise that the earnings of the middle peasant are often disproportionate to present-day prices for manufactured goods and *must* be raised.

Every class-conscious worker will explain this to the middle peasant and will patiently, persistently, and repeatedly point out to him that socialism is infinitely more beneficial for him than a government of the tsars, landowners and capitalists.

The workers' government has never wronged and never will wrong the middle peasant. But the government of the tsars, landowners, capitalists and kulaks not only always wronged the middle peasant, but stifled, plundered, and

ruined him outright. And this is true of all countries without exception, Russia included.

The class-conscious worker's programme is the closest alliance and complete unity with the poor peasants; concessions to and agreement with the middle peasants; ruthless suppression of the kulaks, those bloodsuckers, vampires, plunderers of the people and profiteers, who batten on famine. That is the policy of the working class.

Written in the first part
of August 1918

Published according to
the manuscript

**DRAFT OF TELEGRAM TO ALL SOVIETS
OF DEPUTIES
CONCERNING THE WORKER-
PEASANT ALLIANCE²⁴**

The Poor Peasants' Committees are necessary to fight the kulaks, the rich, the exploiters, who shackle the working peasants. But between the kulaks, who are a small minority, and the poor or semi-proletarians there is the section of the middle peasants. The Soviet government has never declared or conducted any struggle against them. Any steps or measures to the contrary must be condemned most vigorously and stopped. The socialist government must pursue a policy of agreement with the middle peasants. The Soviet government has time and again shown by its actions that it is firmly resolved to pursue this policy. The most important of such actions are the adoption by a Communist (Bolshevik) majority of the law on the socialisation of land and its strictly faithful enforcement, followed by the trebling of grain prices (decree of August ..., 1918). The purport of the decree on agricultural machinery,²⁵ etc., is the same. The policy set forth above is strictly binding on everyone.

Written August 16, 1918

Published according to
the manuscript

**SPEECHES AT A MEETING
OF THE MOSCOW PARTY COMMITTEE
ON ORGANISING GROUPS OF SYMPATHISERS
AUGUST 16, 1918 ²⁰**

MINUTES

1

We are experiencing a great shortage of forces, yet forces are to be had among the people, forces that can be utilised. Greater confidence must be shown in the working people and we must learn to draw forces from their midst. This can be done by enlisting sympathisers among the young people and the trade unions into the Party. Never mind if their membership dues are in arrears—there is no danger in that. There is no great danger in assigning six thousand for the front and taking on twelve thousand others in their place. We must utilise our moral influence to enlarge our Party.

All too few new people get up and speak at our meetings, yet we want new people because there would be a live note in their speeches. We should organise this in some way or other. The young people must be taken from among the workers so that there is control by the workers. The exigencies of the situation demand that large numbers of Party members be sent to the front, before the Japanese and the Americans can consolidate their position in Siberia. These old forces must be replaced by new forces, by young people.

2

Party members must carry on energetic agitation among the workers. Comrades who are capable of doing anything at all must not be kept in office jobs.

We must broaden our sphere of influence among the workers. The nuclei are displaying too little initiative; their activities could be very useful in influencing non-Party people on the spot. Attention should be paid to the clubs, Party workers recruited from the masses.

We must not accept people who try to join from careerist motives; people like this should be driven out of the Party.

|

Published according to
the handwritten copy of
the minutes

LETTER TO AMERICAN WORKERS¹⁷

Comrades! A Russian Bolshevik who took part in the 1905 Revolution, and who lived in your country for many years afterwards, has offered to convey my letter to you. I have accepted his proposal all the more gladly because just at the present time the American revolutionary workers have to play an exceptionally important role as uncompromising enemies of American imperialism—the freshest, strongest and latest in joining in the world-wide slaughter of nations for the division of capitalist profits. At this very moment, the American multimillionaires, these modern slaveowners, have turned an exceptionally tragic page in the bloody history of bloody imperialism by giving their approval—whether direct or indirect, open or hypocritically concealed, makes no difference—to the armed expedition launched by the brutal Anglo-Japanese imperialists for the purpose of throttling the first socialist republic.

The history of modern, civilised America opened with one of those great, really liberating, really revolutionary wars of which there have been so few compared to the vast number of wars of conquest which, like the present imperialist war, were caused by squabbles among kings, landowners or capitalists over the division of usurped lands or ill-gotten gains. That was the war the American people waged against the British robbers who oppressed America and held her in colonial slavery, in the same way as these "civilised" blood-suckers are still oppressing and holding in colonial slavery hundreds of millions of people in India, Egypt, and all parts of the world.

About 150 years have passed since then. Bourgeois civilisation has borne all its luxurious fruits. America has taken

first place among the free and educated nations in level of development of the productive forces of collective human endeavour, in the utilisation of machinery and of all the wonders of modern engineering. At the same time, America has become one of the foremost countries in regard to the depth of the abyss which lies between the handful of arrogant multimillionaires who wallow in filth and luxury, and the millions of working people who constantly live on the verge of pauperism. The American people, who set the world an example in waging a revolutionary war against feudal slavery, now find themselves in the latest, capitalist stage of wage-slavery to a handful of multimillionaires, and find themselves playing the role of hired thugs who, for the benefit of wealthy scoundrels, throttled the Philippines in 1898 on the pretext of "liberating" them, and are throttling the Russian Socialist Republic in 1918 on the pretext of "protecting" it from the Germans.

The four years of the imperialist slaughter of nations, however, have not passed in vain. The deception of the people by the scoundrels of both robber groups, the British and the German, has been utterly exposed by indisputable and obvious facts. The results of the four years of war have revealed the general law of capitalism as applied to war between robbers for the division of spoils: the richest and strongest profited and grabbed most, while the weakest were utterly robbed, tormented, crushed and strangled.

The British imperialist robbers were the strongest in number of "colonial slaves". The British capitalists have not lost an inch of "their" territory (i.e., territory they have grabbed over the centuries), but they have grabbed all the German colonies in Africa, they have grabbed Mesopotamia and Palestine, they have throttled Greece, and have begun to plunder Russia.

The German imperialist robbers were the strongest in organisation and discipline of "their" armies, but weaker in regard to colonies. They have lost all their colonies, but plundered half of Europe and throttled the largest number of small countries and weak nations. What a great war of "liberation" on both sides! How well the robbers of both groups, the Anglo-French and the German capitalists, together with their lackeys, the social-chauvinists, i.e., the

socialists who went over to the side of "*their own*" bourgeoisie, have "defended their country"!

The American multimillionaires were, perhaps, richest of all, and geographically the most secure. They have profited more than all the rest. They have converted all, even the richest, countries into their tributaries. They have grabbed hundreds of billions of dollars. And every dollar is sullied with filth: the filth of the secret treaties between Britain and her "allies", between Germany and her vassals, treaties for the division of the spoils, treaties of mutual "aid" for oppressing the workers and persecuting the internationalist socialists. Every dollar is sullied with the filth of "profitable" war contracts, which in every country made the rich richer and the poor poorer. And every dollar is stained with blood—from that ocean of blood that has been shed by the ten million killed and twenty million maimed in the great, noble, liberating and holy war to decide whether the British or the German robbers are to get most of the spoils, whether the British or the German thugs are to be *foremost* in throttling the weak nations all over the world.

While the German robbers broke all records in war atrocities, the British have broken all records not only in the number of colonies they have grabbed, but also in the subtlety of their disgusting hypocrisy. This very day, the Anglo-French and American bourgeois newspapers are spreading, in millions and millions of copies, lies and slander about Russia, and are hypocritically justifying their predatory expedition against her on the plea that they want to "protect" Russia from the Germans!

It does not require many words to refute this despicable and hideous lie; it is sufficient to point to one well-known fact. In October 1917, after the Russian workers had overthrown their imperialist government, the Soviet government, the government of the revolutionary workers and peasants, openly proposed a just peace, a peace without annexations or indemnities, a peace that fully guaranteed equal rights to all nations—and it proposed such a peace to *all* the belligerent countries.

It was the Anglo-French and the American bourgeoisie who refused to accept our proposal; it was they who even refused to talk to us about a general peace! It was *they* who

betrayed the interests of all nations; it was they who prolonged the imperialist slaughter!

It was they who, banking on the possibility of dragging Russia back into the imperialist war, refused to take part in the peace negotiations and thereby gave a free hand to the no less predatory German capitalists who imposed the annexationist and harsh Brest Peace upon Russia!

It is difficult to imagine anything more disgusting than the hypocrisy with which the Anglo-French and American bourgeoisie are now "blaming" us for the Brest Peace Treaty. The very capitalists of those countries which could have turned the Brest negotiations into general negotiations for a general peace are now our "accusers"! The Anglo-French imperialist vultures, who have profited from the plunder of colonies and the slaughter of nations, have prolonged the war for nearly a whole year after Brest, and yet they "accuse" us, the Bolsheviks, who proposed a just peace to all countries, they accuse us, who tore up, published and exposed to public disgrace the secret, criminal treaties concluded between the ex-tsar and the Anglo-French capitalists.

The workers of the whole world, no matter in what country they live, greet us, sympathise with us, applaud us for breaking the iron ring of imperialist ties, of sordid imperialist treaties, of imperialist chains—for breaking through to freedom, and making the heaviest sacrifices in doing so—for, as a socialist republic, although torn and plundered by the imperialists, keeping out of the imperialist war and raising the banner of peace, the banner of socialism for the whole world to see.

Small wonder that the international imperialist gang hates us for this, that it "accuses" us, that all the lackeys of the imperialists, including our Right Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks, also "accuse" us. The hatred these watchdogs of imperialism express for the Bolsheviks, and the sympathy of the class-conscious workers of the world, convince us more than ever of the justice of our cause.

A real socialist would not fail to understand that for the sake of achieving victory over the bourgeoisie, for the sake of power passing to the workers, for the sake of starting the world proletarian revolution, we cannot and must not hesitate to make the heaviest sacrifices, including the sacrifice

of part of our territory, the sacrifice of heavy defeats at the hands of imperialism. A real socialist would have proved by *deeds* his willingness for "his" country to make the greatest sacrifice to give a real push forward to the cause of the socialist revolution.

For the sake of "their" cause, that is, for the sake of winning world hegemony, the imperialists of Britain and Germany have not hesitated to utterly ruin and throttle a whole number of countries, from Belgium and Serbia to Palestine and Mesopotamia. But must socialists wait with "their" cause, the cause of liberating the working people of the whole world from the yoke of capital, of winning universal and lasting peace, until a path without sacrifice is found? Must they fear to open the battle until an easy victory is "guaranteed"? Must they place the integrity and security of "their" bourgeois-created "fatherland" above the interests of the world socialist revolution? The scoundrels in the international socialist movement who think this way, those lackeys who grovel to bourgeois morality, thrice stand condemned.

The Anglo-French and American imperialist vultures "accuse" us of concluding an "agreement" with German imperialism. What hypocrites, what scoundrels they are to slander the workers' government while trembling because of the sympathy displayed towards us by the workers of "their own" countries! But their hypocrisy will be exposed. They pretend not to see the difference between an agreement entered into by "socialists" with the bourgeoisie (their own or foreign) *against the workers*, against the working people, and an agreement entered into *for the protection* of the workers who have defeated their bourgeoisie, with the bourgeoisie of one national colour *against the bourgeoisie* of another colour in order that the proletariat may take advantage of the antagonisms between the different groups of bourgeoisie.

In actual fact, every European sees this difference very well, and, as I shall show in a moment, the American people have had a particularly striking "illustration" of it in their own history. There are agreements and agreements, there are *fagots et fagots*, as the French say.

When in February 1918 the German imperialist vultures hurled their forces against unarmed, demobilised Russia,

who had relied on the international solidarity of the proletariat before the world revolution had fully matured, I did not hesitate for a moment to enter into an "agreement" with the French monarchists. Captain Sadoul, a French army officer who, in words, sympathised with the Bolsheviks, but was in deeds a loyal and faithful servant of French imperialism, brought the French officer de Lubersac to see me. "I am a monarchist. My only aim is to secure the defeat of Germany," de Lubersac declared to me. "That goes without saying (*cela va sans dire*)," I replied. But this did not in the least prevent me from entering into an "agreement" with de Lubersac concerning certain services that French army officers, experts in explosives, were ready to render us by blowing up railway lines in order to hinder the German invasion. This is an example of an "agreement" of which every class-conscious worker will approve, an agreement in the interests of socialism. The French monarchist and I shook hands, although we knew that each of us would willingly hang his "partner". But for a time our interests coincided. Against the advancing rapacious Germans, *we*, in the interests of the Russian and the world socialist revolution, utilised the equally rapacious counter-interests of *other* imperialists. In this way we served the interests of the working class of Russia and of other countries, we strengthened the proletariat and weakened the bourgeoisie of the whole world, we resorted to the methods, most legitimate and essential in *every* war, of manoeuvre, stratagem, retreat, in anticipation of the moment when the rapidly maturing proletarian revolution in a number of advanced countries *completely matured*.

However much the Anglo-French and American imperialist sharks fume with rage, however much they slander us, no matter how many millions they spend on bribing the Right Socialist-Revolutionary, Menshevik and other social-patriotic newspapers, *I shall not hesitate one second* to enter into a similar "agreement" with the German imperialist vultures if an attack upon Russia by Anglo-French troops calls for it. And I know perfectly well that my tactics will be approved by the class-conscious proletariat of Russia, Germany, France, Britain, America—in short, of the whole civilised world. Such tactics will ease the task of the socialist revolution, will hasten it, will weaken the international bourgeoisie,

will strengthen the position of the working class which is defeating the bourgeoisie.

The American people resorted to these tactics long ago to the advantage of their revolution. When they waged their great war of liberation against the British oppressors, they had also against them the French and the Spanish oppressors who owned a part of what is now the United States of North America. In their arduous war for freedom, the American people also entered into "agreements" with some oppressors against others for the purpose of weakening the oppressors and strengthening those who were fighting in a revolutionary manner against oppression, for the purpose of serving the interests of the oppressed *people*. The American people took advantage of the strife between the French, the Spanish and the British; sometimes they even fought side by side with the forces of the French and Spanish oppressors against the British oppressors; first they defeated the British and then freed themselves (partly by ransom) from the French and the Spanish.

Historical action is not the pavement of Nevsky Prospekt, said the great Russian revolutionary Chernyshevsky.²⁸ A revolutionary would not "agree" to a proletarian revolution only "on the condition" that it proceeds easily and smoothly, that there is, from the outset, combined action on the part of the proletarians of different countries, that there are guarantees against defeats, that the road of the revolution is broad, free and straight, that it will not be necessary during the march to victory to sustain the heaviest casualties, to "bide one's time in a besieged fortress", or to make one's way along extremely narrow, impassable, winding and dangerous mountain tracks. Such a person is no revolutionary, he has not freed himself from the pedantry of the bourgeois intellectuals; such a person will be found constantly slipping into the camp of the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie, like our Right Socialist-Revolutionaries, Mensheviks and even (although more rarely) Left Socialist-Revolutionaries.

Echoing the bourgeoisie, these gentlemen like to blame us for the "chaos" of the revolution, for the "destruction" of industry, for the unemployment and the food shortage. How hypocritical these accusations are, coming from those who welcomed and supported the imperialist war, or who

entered into an "agreement" with Kerensky who continued this war! It is this imperialist war that is the cause of all these misfortunes. The revolution engendered by the war cannot avoid the terrible difficulties and suffering bequeathed it by the prolonged, ruinous, reactionary slaughter of the nations. To blame us for the "destruction" of industry, or for the "terror", is either hypocrisy or dull-witted pedantry; it reveals an inability to understand the basic conditions of the fierce class struggle, raised to the highest degree of intensity that is called revolution.

Even when "accusers" of this type do "recognise" the class struggle, they limit themselves to verbal recognition; actually, they constantly slip into the philistine utopia of class "agreement" and "collaboration"; for in revolutionary epochs the class struggle has always, inevitably, and in every country, assumed the form of *civil war*, and civil war is inconceivable without the severest destruction, terror and the restriction of formal democracy in the interests of this war. Only unctuous persons—whether Christian or "secular" in the persons of parlour, parliamentary socialists—cannot see, understand and feel this necessity. Only a lifeless "man in the muffler"²⁹ can shun the revolution for this reason instead of plunging into battle with the utmost ardour and determination at a time when history demands that the greatest problems of humanity be solved by struggle and war.

The American people have a revolutionary tradition which has been adopted by the best representatives of the American proletariat, who have repeatedly expressed their complete solidarity with us Bolsheviks. That tradition is the war of liberation against the British in the eighteenth century and the Civil War in the nineteenth century. In some respects, if we only take into consideration the "destruction" of some branches of industry and of the national economy, America in 1870 was *behind* 1860. But what a pedant, what an idiot would anyone be to deny on *these* grounds the immense, world-historic, progressive and revolutionary significance of the American Civil War of 1863-65!

The representatives of the bourgeoisie understand that for the sake of overthrowing Negro slavery, of overthrowing the rule of the slaveowners, it was worth letting the country go through long years of civil war, through the abysmal

ruin, destruction and terror that accompany every war. But now, when we are confronted with the vastly greater task of overthrowing capitalist *wage-slavery*, of overthrowing the rule of the bourgeoisie—now, the representatives and defenders of the bourgeoisie, and also the reformist socialists who have been frightened by the bourgeoisie and are shunning the revolution, cannot and do not want to understand that civil war is necessary and legitimate.

The American workers will not follow the bourgeoisie. They will be with us, for civil war against the bourgeoisie. The whole history of the world and of the American labour movement strengthens my conviction that this is so. I also recall the words of one of the most beloved leaders of the American proletariat, Eugene Debs, who wrote in the *Appeal to Reason*,³⁰ I believe towards the end of 1915, in the article "What Shall I Fight For" (I quoted this article at the beginning of 1916 at a public meeting of workers in Berne, Switzerland)*—that he, Debs, would rather be shot than vote credits for the present criminal and reactionary war; that he, Debs, knows of only one holy and, from the proletarian standpoint, legitimate war, namely: the war against the capitalists, the war to liberate mankind from *wage-slavery*.

I am not surprised that Wilson, the head of the American multimillionaires and servant of the capitalist sharks, has thrown Debs into prison. Let the bourgeoisie be brutal to the true internationalists, to the true representatives of the revolutionary proletariat! The more fierce and brutal they are, the nearer the day of the victorious proletarian revolution.

We are blamed for the destruction caused by our revolution.... Who are the accusers? The hangers-on of the bourgeoisie, of that very bourgeoisie who, during the four years of the imperialist war, have destroyed almost the whole of European culture and have reduced Europe to barbarism, brutality and starvation. These bourgeoisie now demand we should not make a revolution on these ruins, amidst this wreckage of culture, amidst the wreckage and ruins created by the war, nor with the people who have been brutalised by the war. How humane and righteous the bourgeoisie are!

Their servants accuse us of resorting to terror.... The British bourgeoisie have forgotten their 1649, the French bourgeoisie have forgotten their 1793. Terror was just and legitimate when the bourgeoisie resorted to it for their own benefit against feudalism. Terror became monstrous and criminal when the workers and poor peasants dared to use it against the bourgeoisie! Terror was just and legitimate when used for the purpose of substituting one exploiting minority for another exploiting minority. Terror became monstrous and criminal when it began to be used for the purpose of overthrowing *every* exploiting minority, to be used in the interests of the vast actual majority, in the interests of the proletariat and semi-proletariat, the working class and the poor peasants!

The international imperialist bourgeoisie have slaughtered ten million men and maimed twenty million in "their" war, the war to decide whether the British or the German vultures are to rule the world.

If *our* war, the war of the oppressed and exploited against the oppressors and the exploiters, results in half a million or a million casualties in all countries, the bourgeoisie will say that the former casualties are justified, while the latter are criminal.

The proletariat will have something entirely different to say.

Now, amidst the horrors of the imperialist war, the proletariat is receiving a most vivid and striking illustration of the great truth taught by all revolutions and bequeathed to the workers by their best teachers, the founders of modern socialism. This truth is that no revolution can be successful unless *the resistance of the exploiters is crushed*. When we, the workers and toiling peasants, captured state power, it became our duty to crush the resistance of the exploiters. We are proud we have been doing this. We regret we are not doing it with sufficient firmness and determination.

We know that fierce resistance to the socialist revolution on the part of the bourgeoisie is inevitable in all countries, and that this resistance will *grow* with the growth of this revolution. The proletariat will crush this resistance; during the struggle against the resisting bourgeoisie it will finally mature for victory and for power.

Let the corrupt bourgeois press shout to the whole world

about every mistake our revolution makes. We are not daunted by our mistakes. People have not become saints because the revolution has begun. The toiling classes who for centuries have been oppressed, downtrodden and forcibly held in the vice of poverty, brutality and ignorance cannot avoid mistakes when making a revolution. And, as I pointed out once before, the corpse of bourgeois society cannot be nailed in a coffin and buried.* The corpse of capitalism is decaying and disintegrating in our midst, polluting the air and poisoning our lives, enmeshing that which is new, fresh, young and virile in thousands of threads and bonds of that which is old, moribund and decaying.

For every hundred mistakes we commit, and which the bourgeoisie and their lackeys (including our own Mensheviks and Right Socialist-Revolutionaries) shout about to the whole world, 10,000 great and heroic deeds are performed, greater and more heroic because they are simple and inconspicuous amidst the everyday life of a factory district or a remote village, performed by people who are not accustomed (and have no opportunity) to shout to the whole world about their successes.

But even if the contrary were true—although I know such an assumption is wrong—even if we committed 10,000 mistakes for every 100 correct actions we performed, even in that case our revolution would be great and invincible, and *so it will be in the eyes of world history*, because, *for the first time*, not the minority, not the rich alone, not the educated alone, but the real people, the vast majority of the working people, are *themselves* building a new life, are *by their own experience* solving the most difficult problems of socialist organisation.

Every mistake committed in the course of such work, in the course of this most conscientious and earnest work of tens of millions of simple workers and peasants in reorganising their whole life, every such mistake is worth thousands and millions of "flawless" successes achieved by the exploiting minority—successes in swindling and duping the working people. For only *through* such mistakes will the workers and peasants *learn* to build the new life, *learn to do without*

capitalists; only in this way will they hack a path for themselves—through thousands of obstacles—to victorious socialism.

Mistakes are being committed in the course of their revolutionary work by our peasants, who at one stroke, in one night, October 25-26 (old style), 1917, entirely abolished the private ownership of land, and are now, month after month, overcoming tremendous difficulties and correcting their mistakes themselves, solving in a practical way the most difficult tasks of organising new conditions of economic life, of fighting the kulaks, providing land for the *working people* (and not for the rich), and of changing to communist large-scale agriculture.

Mistakes are being committed in the course of their revolutionary work by our workers, who have already, after a few months, nationalised almost all the biggest factories and plants, and are learning by hard, everyday work the new task of managing whole branches of industry, are setting the nationalised enterprises going, overcoming the powerful resistance of inertia, petty-bourgeois mentality and selfishness, and, brick by brick, are laying the foundation of *new* social ties, of a *new* labour discipline, of a *new* influence of the workers' trade unions over their members.

Mistakes are committed in the course of their revolutionary work by our Soviets, which were created as far back as 1905 by a mighty upsurge of the people. The Soviets of Workers and Peasants are a new *type* of state, a new and higher *type* of democracy, a form of the proletarian dictatorship, a means of administering the state *without* the bourgeoisie and *against* the bourgeoisie. For the first time democracy is here serving the people, the working people, and has ceased to be democracy for the rich as it still is in all bourgeois republics, even the most democratic. For the first time, the people are grappling, on a scale involving one hundred million, with the problem of implementing the dictatorship of the proletariat and semi-proletariat—a problem which, if not solved, makes socialism *out of the question*.

Let the pedants, or the people whose minds are incurably stuffed with bourgeois-democratic or parliamentary prejudices, shake their heads in perplexity about our Soviets, about the absence of direct elections, for example. These people

have forgotten nothing and have learned nothing during the period of the great upheavals of 1914-18. The combination of the proletarian dictatorship with the new democracy for the working people—of civil war with the widest participation of the people in politics—such a combination cannot be brought about at one stroke, nor does it fit in with the outworn modes of routine parliamentary democracy. The contours of a new world, the world of socialism, are rising before us in the shape of the Soviet Republic. It is not surprising that this world does not come into being ready-made, does not spring forth like Minerva from the head of Jupiter.

The old bourgeois-democratic constitutions waxed eloquent about formal equality and right of assembly; but our proletarian and peasant Soviet Constitution casts aside the hypocrisy of formal equality. When the bourgeois republicans overturned thrones they did not worry about formal equality between monarchists and republicans. When it is a matter of overthrowing the bourgeoisie, only traitors or idiots can demand formal equality of rights for the bourgeoisie. "Freedom of assembly" for workers and peasants is not worth a farthing when the best buildings belong to the bourgeoisie. Our Soviets have *confiscated* all the good buildings in town and country from the rich and have *transferred all* of them to the workers and peasants for *their* unions and meetings. This is *our* freedom of assembly—for the working people! This is the meaning and content of our Soviet, our socialist Constitution!

That is why we are all so firmly convinced that no matter what misfortunes may still be in store for it, our Republic of Soviets is *invincible*.

It is invincible because every blow struck by frenzied imperialism, every defeat the international bourgeoisie inflict on us, rouses more and more sections of the workers and peasants to the struggle, teaches them at the cost of enormous sacrifice, steels them and engenders new heroism on a mass scale.

We know that help from you will probably not come soon, comrade American workers, for the revolution is developing in different countries in different forms and at different tempos (and it cannot be otherwise). We know that although the European proletarian revolution has been maturing very

rapidly lately, it may, after all, not flare up within the next few weeks. We are banking on the inevitability of the world revolution, but this does not mean that we are such fools as to bank on the revolution inevitably coming on a *definite* and early date. We have seen two great revolutions in our country, 1905 and 1917, and we know revolutions are not made to order, or by agreement. We know that circumstances brought *our* Russian detachment of the socialist proletariat to the fore not because of our merits, but because of the exceptional backwardness of Russia, and that *before* the world revolution breaks out a number of separate revolutions may be defeated.

In spite of this, we are firmly convinced that we are invincible, because the spirit of mankind will not be broken by the imperialist slaughter. Mankind will vanquish it. And the first country to *break* the convict chains of the imperialist war was *our* country. We sustained enormously heavy casualties in the struggle to break these chains, but we *broke* them. We are *free from* imperialist dependence, we have raised the banner of struggle for the complete overthrow of imperialism for the whole world to see.

We are now, as it were, in a besieged fortress, waiting for the other detachments of the world socialist revolution to come to our relief. These detachments *exist*, they are *more numerous* than ours, they are maturing, growing, gaining more strength the longer the brutalities of imperialism continue. The workers are breaking away from their social-traitors—the Gomperses, Hendersons, Renaudels, Scheidemanns and Renners. Slowly but surely the workers are adopting communist, Bolshevik tactics and are marching towards the proletarian revolution, which alone is capable of saving dying culture and dying mankind.

In short, we are invincible, because the world proletarian revolution is invincible.

N. Lenin

August 20, 1918

Pravda No. 178,
August 22, 1918

Published according to
the *Pravda* text checked
with the manuscript

SPEECH AT A MEETING
IN THE ALEXEYEV PEOPLE'S HOUSE
AUGUST 23, 1918
BRIEF NEWSPAPER REPORT

(Comrade Lenin's appearance is greeted with stormy, prolonged applause.) Comrades, today our Party is arranging meetings to explain what we Communists are fighting for.

The most concise answer to this question would be that we are fighting for the termination of the imperialist war and for socialism.

Right at the very outbreak of the war, when reaction and tsarism held sway, we called the war criminal and said that the only way out was to convert it from imperialist into civil war.

In those days many were uncertain about the connection between the imperialist war and socialism; even many socialists thought that this war, like any other, would end by the conclusion of peace.

But four years of war have taught people a lot. It is now becoming clearer and clearer that there is no other way out. The Russian revolution is being followed by the growth of revolution in all the belligerent countries. Why is this so? To answer that question we must explain the attitude of Communists towards war, give our appraisal of it. We regard all wars which are the result of the rapacious ambitions of kings and capitalists as criminal, because they are fatal to the labouring classes and bring rich spoils to the ruling bourgeoisie.

But there are some wars which the working class must regard as the only just wars. These are wars for emancipation from slavery, from capitalist oppression. And such wars are

bound to occur, for we cannot secure our emancipation without struggle.

When the war broke out in 1914 between the Germans on the one hand and the British and French on the other to determine how they were to divide up the earth among themselves, who was to have the right to oppress the whole world, the capitalists of both camps tried to disguise their predatory aims by talking about "national defence"; that is how they tried to pull the wool over the eyes of the people.

Millions of people have been killed and millions crippled in this war. It has become world-wide. And more and more insistently people are asking what is the purpose of these unnecessary sacrifices.

Britain and Germany are drenched in blood, yet there is no way out of the war; even if some of the imperialist countries were to stop fighting, others would continue.

The capitalists have overreached themselves, they have grabbed more than they can hold. Meanwhile, the armies are becoming demoralised; there are deserters everywhere. The mountains of Italy are swarming with them; in France soldiers are refusing to fight, and even in Germany the old discipline has fallen apart.

French and German soldiers are beginning to realise they must reverse their front and turn their guns against their own governments, as it is impossible to end this bloody war under the capitalist system. Hence the realisation that the workers of the world must take up the struggle against the capitalists of the world.

It is no easy matter to create a socialist system. The Civil War is bound to continue for many a long month, perhaps for many a long year. This should be clear to a Russian, for he knows how difficult it is to overthrow the ruling class and what desperate resistance the Russian landowners and capitalists are putting up.

There is no country in Europe in which the workers are not in sympathy with the Bolsheviks and are not convinced that the time will come when they will overthrow their own government, just as the Russian workers have overthrown theirs.

We Russian Communists so far stand alone, because our detachment has proved to be ahead of all the others. We

have been cut off from our comrades; but we had to act first because our country was the most backward. Our revolution was begun as a general revolution, and we shall tackle our tasks with the help of the workers and peasants of the world.

Our tasks are hard and difficult; many undesirable and pernicious elements are joining our ranks. But the work has begun, and even if we do make mistakes, we should remember that every mistake is an education and a lesson.

Capitalism is an international force, and it can therefore be completely destroyed only through victory in all countries, not in one alone. The war against the Czechs is a war against the capitalists of the whole world.

The workers are rising and joining this struggle; the Petrograd and Moscow workers are joining the army and bringing with them the idea of fighting for the victory of socialism.

The workers will ensure the victory of the Soviet Republic over the Czechs and give it a chance to hold out until the world socialist revolution breaks out. (*Comrade Lenin concludes his speech amidst stormy applause.*)

Izvestia No. 182,
August 24, 1918

Published according to
the *Izvestia* text

**SPEECH IN POLYTECHNICAL MUSEUM
AUGUST 23, 1918**

(Stormy applause.) What is the essence of our programme? Winning socialism. There is no way out of the world war at this moment except by the victory of socialism. But many do not realise this. Most people all over the world now oppose this bloody slaughter, but they cannot see its direct connection with the capitalist system. The horrors of this war are obvious even to the bourgeoisie, but you cannot expect them to associate the end of the war with the end of capitalism.... This, however, is the fundamental idea which has always distinguished the Bolsheviks, and the revolutionary socialists of all other countries, from those who would like to bring peace on earth while leaving the capitalist system intact.

What are wars fought for? We know the majority of wars were fought in the interests of dynasties, and were called dynastic wars. But some wars were fought in the interests of the oppressed. Spartacus set off a war in defence of the enslaved class. Wars of this nature were waged in the period of colonial oppression continuing to this day, in the period of slavery, etc. These wars were just wars and must not be condemned.

But when we talk about the present European war and condemn it, we do so only because it is being waged by the oppressor class.

What is the aim of the present war? If we are to believe the diplomats of all countries, it is being fought by France and Britain to defend the small nations from the barbarians, the German Huns. Germany, for her part, is fighting the Cossack barbarians who are menacing the civilised German people, and is defending the fatherland from the enemy attack.

But we know this war was carefully prepared, it matured and became inevitable. It was just as inevitable as war is between America and Japan. Why?

Because capitalism has concentrated the earth's wealth in the hands of a few states and divided the world up to the last little bit. Any further division, any further enrichment could take place only at the expense of others, as the enrichment of one state at the expense of another. The issue could only be settled by force—and, accordingly, war between the world marauders became inevitable.

This war has up to now been headed by two principal firms—Britain and Germany. Britain was the strongest of the colonialist countries. Although her population is not more than 40,000,000, that of her colonies exceeds 400,000,000. Long ago she took by force the colonies of others; she seized vast territories and exploited them. But economically she fell behind Germany during the last fifty years. German industry overhauled British industry. Germany's large-scale state capitalism combined with the bureaucracy—and Germany beat all records.

The rivalry for supremacy between these two giants could only be settled by force.

There was a time when Britain, by dint of her might, seized territory from Holland, Portugal and other countries. Then Germany appeared on the scene and declared that it was now her turn to enrich herself at the expense of others.

That is the root of the matter—the struggle between the strongest powers for the division of the world. And as both sides possess hundreds of millions of capital, their struggle has become world-wide.

We know how many secret crimes have been committed in connection with this war. The secret treaties we have published show that the lofty reasons given for the war are just a lot of empty talk, and that, just like Russia, all the states were involved in sordid treaties for getting rich at the expense of small and weak nations. The result was that those who were strong grew richer still, while those who were weak were crushed.

Individuals cannot be blamed for starting the war; it would be wrong to blame kings and tsars for having brought

about this holocaust—it was brought about by capital. Capitalism has turned into a blind alley. This blind alley is imperialism, which dictated war among the rivals for world supremacy.

The claim that the war is being waged for the liberation of small nations is a monstrous lie. Both sets of marauders continue to stand glaring bloodthirstily at each other, while about them many a small nation lies crushed.

And we say there is no way out of the imperialist holocaust except by civil war.

When we said this in 1914 we were told it was like a straight line extending into space; but our analysis has been corroborated by the whole subsequent course of events. Today we find chauvinism's generals being left without an army. In France, which suffered most from the war and was most responsive to the call to defend the fatherland—for the enemy stood at the gates of Paris—the defence advocates have recently suffered a fiasco. True enough, it was at the hands of people like Longuet, who do not know whether they are coming or going, but that is not important.

We know that in the early days of the revolution in Russia power fell into the hands of people who spouted all sorts of words but kept the old tsarist treaties in their pockets. And if in Russia parties veered to the left more rapidly, this was due to the accursed regime that existed before the revolution and to our Revolution of 1905.

In Europe, though, where a shrewd and calculating capitalism rules, where it possesses a powerful and well-knit organisation, the fumes of nationalism are wearing off more slowly. Nevertheless, we can unmistakably see that the imperialist war is dying a slow and painful death.

There is quite reliable information to show that the German army is becoming demoralised, and has taken to profiteering. It could hardly be otherwise. The moment the soldier wakes up and begins to understand that he is being maimed and killed solely in the interests of the bourgeoisie, demoralisation is bound to spread among the mass of soldiers.

The French army, which kept its morale longer and more persistently than any of the others, likewise shows that it

is not immune to demoralisation. The Malvy trial has somewhat lifted the curtain over the scene in France, too, and has revealed that thousands of soldiers have refused to go to the front.³¹

All this is but the herald of events similar to those in Russia, except that in the civilised countries the civil war will be far more brutal than in Russia. We can see that in the case of Finland, the most democratic country in Europe, the first country to give women the vote. Yet this country took savage and ruthless reprisals on the Red Army men; and the latter did not surrender easily. This shows what a terrible fate awaits these civilised countries.

You can see for yourselves how absurd it was to accuse the Bolsheviks of demoralising the Russian army.

We represent only one detachment, a detachment which has advanced some way ahead of the other workers' detachments—not because it is any better than the others, but because the stupid policy of our bourgeoisie enabled the working class of Russia to throw off its chains sooner. Today, in fighting for a socialist system in Russia, we are fighting for socialism all over the world. Today, the Bolsheviks are the sole subject of discussion at all workers' meetings and gatherings in all countries. They know us; they know that what we are now doing is furthering the cause of the whole world, that we are working for them.

When we abolish private ownership of land, nationalise the factories and the banks, which are now engaged in organising industry, cries are raised on all sides that we are committing hosts of mistakes. That may be true, but the workers are creating socialism themselves, and no matter what mistakes we make we are learning from experience and paving the way for the art of making revolution without mistakes.

That is why we are the objects of such savage hatred. That is why the French imperialists do not begrudge hundreds of millions to support counter-revolution, since this would bring the repayment to France of the Russian debts, running into billions, which the workers and peasants have annulled.

Today the whole bourgeois press is amusing itself by filling its columns with such lies as that the Council of People's

Commissars has moved to Tula, that it was seen ten days ago in Kronstadt, and so on, that Moscow is about to fall and that the Soviet Government has fled.

The whole bourgeoisie, all the Romanovs, all the capitalists and landowners support the Czechs, whose revolt they associate with the possible fall of the Soviet government. The Allies know this, and they are launching one of their fiercest attacks. What they lacked in Russia was a nucleus, and now they have found it in the Czechs. The Czech revolt therefore must not be treated lightly. This revolt was the signal for a number of counter-revolutionary risings; our revolutionary history has recently been marked by many kulak and whiteguard revolts.

The position of the Soviet government is grave, and we must not close our eyes to the fact. But you have only to look around you to be filled with confidence in our victory.

Germany has suffered a number of defeats, and it is no secret that these defeats are the result of "treason" on the part of German soldiers; French soldiers refused to go to the front at a very critical moment because of the arrest of Comrade Andrieux whom the government was compelled to release to get the troops to move, and so on and so forth.

We have made many sacrifices. The Brest-Litovsk Peace was one painful wound; we expected a revolution in Germany, but the time for it was not yet ripe. It is ripening now; revolution is undoubtedly brewing and is inevitable. But only a fool can ask when revolution will break out in the West. Revolution can never be forecast; it cannot be foretold; it comes of itself. Revolution is brewing and is bound to flare up. Did anybody know a week before the February revolution it was about to break out? When the mad priest led the people to the palace,³² did anybody think the Revolution of 1905 was about to break out? But revolution is brewing and is bound to come.

And we must keep the Soviet government intact until it begins. Our mistakes must serve as a lesson to the proletariat in the West, to the world socialist movement. The salvation of the world revolution as well as of the Russian revolution lies on the Czech front. And we already have news that

the army which time and again was betrayed by the generals, which is terribly exhausted, that this army, with the coming of our comrades, the Communists, the workers, is beginning to win victories, is beginning to display revolutionary enthusiasm in the struggle against the world bourgeoisie.

“We believe that victory will be ours and that by our victory we shall save the cause of socialism. (*Stormy applause.*)

Short report published
in *Izvestia* No. 182,
August 24, 1918

Published according to
the verbatim report

SPEECH
AT THE FIRST ALL-RUSSIA CONGRESS
ON EDUCATION ^{}**
AUGUST 28, 1918

(All rise as Comrade Lenin appears in the hall. Stormy, prolonged applause.) Comrades, we are passing through one of the most critical, important and interesting moments of history—a moment when the world socialist revolution is in the making. It is now becoming apparent even to those who stood remote from socialist theories and forecasts that this war will not end as it began, that is, by the conclusion of peace in the usual way between the old imperialist governments. The Russian revolution has shown that the war is inevitably leading to the disintegration of capitalist society in general, that it is being converted into a war of the working people against the exploiters. Therein lies the significance of the Russian revolution.

The workers of the world feel that the cause of the Russian revolution is their own cause no matter how great the obstacles in our way, no matter how many tens of millions in money are lavished in all countries to disseminate lies and slander about the Russian revolution. Parallel with the war between the two groups of imperialists, another war is beginning everywhere, the war which the working class, inspired by the example of the Russian revolution, is declaring against its own bourgeoisie. All the signs go to show that Austria and Italy are on the verge of revolution. The old order in these countries is disintegrating rapidly. In the stronger and more stable countries such as Germany, Britain and France, the same process is going on, although in a somewhat different and

less noticeable form. The collapse of the capitalist system and the capitalist war is inevitable.

The German imperialists have been unable to stifle the socialist revolution. The price Germany had to pay for crushing the revolution in Red Latvia, Finland and the Ukraine was the demoralisation of her army. The defeat of Germany on the Western front is largely due to the fact that her old army no longer exists. What the German diplomats joked about—the "Russification" of the German soldiers—now turns out to be no joke at all, but the bitter truth. The spirit of protest is rising, "treason" is becoming a common thing in the German army.

On the other hand, Britain and France are making a last effort to save their own situation. They are hurling themselves on the Russian Republic and straining capitalism to breaking point. Even the bourgeois papers have to admit that a definite change of spirit has appeared among the working people: in France, the idea of "national defence" is breaking down; in Britain, the working class is denouncing the "civil truce". That means the British and French imperialists have staked their last card—and we can say with the utmost confidence that that card will be trumped. (*Stormy applause.*) No matter how loudly certain groups cry that the Bolsheviks are backed by a minority, they have to admit they cannot find the forces inside Russia to fight the Bolsheviks, and are compelled to resort to foreign intervention. The working class of France and Britain is thus being forced to take part in a blatant war of conquest, whose purpose is to crush the Russian revolution. That means that British and French, and, consequently, world imperialism is at its last gasp. (*Stormy applause.*)

We have surmounted all difficulties, even though it was hard to declare martial law again in a country where the people themselves had suppressed the war and smashed the old army, and even though it was hard to form an army in the midst of acute civil war. The army has been formed, and victory over the Czechs, the whiteguards, the landowners, the capitalists and the kulaks is assured. (*Stormy applause.*) The working people realise they are fighting for their own cause and not in the interests of a handful of capitalists. The Russian workers and peasants have for the first time got a

chance to run the factories and dispose of the land themselves, and that experience was bound to have its effect. Our army has been formed from chosen people, from the class-conscious peasants and workers. Each of them goes to the front aware that he is fighting for the destiny of the world revolution as well as the Russian revolution; for we may rest assured that the Russian revolution is only a sample, only the first step in the series of revolutions in which the war is bound to end.

Education is one of the component parts of the struggle we are now waging. We can counter hypocrisy and lies with the complete and honest truth. The war has shown plainly enough what the "will of the majority" means, a phrase used as a cover by the bourgeoisie. It has shown that a handful of plutocrats drag whole nations to the slaughter in their own interests. The belief that bourgeois democracy serves the interests of the majority has now been utterly discredited. Our Constitution, our Soviets, which were something new to Europe, but with which we were already acquainted from the experience of the 1905 Revolution, serve as splendid agitation and propaganda material, completely exposing the lying and hypocritical nature of bourgeois democracy. We have openly proclaimed the rule of the working and exploited people—and there lies the source of our strength and invincibility.

The same is true of education: the more cultured the bourgeois state, the more subtly it lied when declaring that schools could stand above politics and serve society as a whole.

In fact the schools were turned into nothing but an instrument of the class rule of the bourgeoisie. They were thoroughly imbued with the bourgeois caste spirit. Their purpose was to supply the capitalists with obedient lackeys and able workers. The war has shown that the marvels of modern technology are being used as a means of exterminating millions of workers and creating fabulous profits for the capitalists who are making fortunes out of the war. The war has been internally undermined, for we have exposed their lies by countering them with the truth. We say that our work in the sphere of education is part of the struggle for overthrowing the bourgeoisie. We publicly declare that education divorced from life and politics is lies and hypocrisy. What was the meaning of

the sabotage resorted to by the best educated representatives of the old bourgeois culture? This sabotage showed better than any agitator, better than all our speeches, better than thousands of pamphlets that these people regard learning as their monopoly and have turned it into an instrument of their rule over the so-called common people. They used their education to frustrate the work of socialist construction, and came out openly against the working people.

The revolutionary struggle has been the finishing school for the Russian workers and peasants. They have seen that our system alone assures their genuine rule, they have been able to convince themselves that the state is doing everything to assist the workers and the poor peasants in completely crushing the resistance of the kulaks, the landowners and the capitalists.

The working people are thirsting for knowledge because they need it to win. Nine out of ten of the working people have realised that knowledge is a weapon in their struggle for emancipation, that their failures are due to lack of education, and that now it is up to them really to give everyone access to education. Our cause is assured because the people have themselves set about building a new, socialist Russia. They are learning from their own experience, from their failures and mistakes, and they see how indispensable education is for the victorious conclusion of their struggle. In spite of the apparent collapse of many institutions and the jubilation of the intellectuals carrying out sabotage, we find that experience in the struggle has taught the people to take their fate into their own hands. All who really sympathise with the people, all the best teachers will come to our aid, and that is a sure pledge that the socialist cause will triumph. (*Ovation.*)

Short report published
August 29, 1918 in
Vecherniye Izvestia Moskovskovo
Soveta No. 35

Published according to
the text of the book

SPEECH AT A MEETING IN BASMANNY DISTRICT AUGUST 30, 1918³⁴

BRIEF NEWSPAPER REPORT

The bourgeoisie made themselves masters of revolutionary Russia for a time, ruling from February to October with the support of the social-compromisers.

With the first steps taken by the Milyukov-Guchkov government, the people began to realise where the bourgeoisie were leading them. But the dirty work of the Russian capitalists and landowners, who were in fact continuing the policy of the tsar the people had overthrown, was covered up by the Mensheviks and the Socialist-Revolutionaries, who pretended to be socialists while actually betraying socialism in the interests of the British and French stock exchanges.

Swept aside by the October uprising, and ousted from the revolution, the compromisers set about their customary work in the Ukraine, the Caucasus, in Siberia and on the Volga. They eventually succeeded in getting the local Soviets overthrown and the Bolshevik members turned over to the tender mercies of the Czech hirelings and the Russian whiteguards.

But what do we find in these places rising out of the ruins of the Soviets? The complete triumph of the capitalists and landowners, and groans and curses from the workers and peasants. The land has been returned to the nobility and the mills and factories to their former owners. The eight-hour day has been abolished, the workers' and peasants' organisations suppressed, and the tsarist Zemstvos³⁵ and the old police regime restored instead.

Let every worker and peasant who is still undecided about his choice of government take a look at the Volga, Siberia, and the Ukraine, and the answer will be clear and unmistakable. (*Stormy, prolonged applause.*)

**SPEECH AT A MEETING
AT THE FORMER MICHELSON WORKS
AUGUST 30, 1918 "**

BRIEF NEWSPAPER REPORT

(Stormy applause passing into ovation.) We Bolsheviks are constantly being accused of forsaking the slogans of equality and fraternity. Let us now put things straight.

What government replaced the tsar? The Guchkov-Milyukov government, which set about convening a Constituent Assembly in Russia. What was behind these activities supposed to be in favour of the people liberated from their millennial oppression? It was that Guchkov and other champions were backed by a gang of capitalists pursuing their own imperialist ends. And when Kerensky, Chernov and Co. were in the saddle, this government, tottering and without any foundation, was only concerned with the vested interests of their friends, the bourgeoisie. Power in fact passed into the hands of the kulaks, and the working people got nothing. We find the same thing in other countries. Take America, the freest and most civilised country. There you have a democratic republic. But what do we find? The brazen rule of a handful, not even of millionaires, but multimillionaires, while the people are in slavery and servitude. Where is your much-vaunted equality and fraternity if the mills, factories, banks, and all the country's wealth belong to the capitalists, and side by side with the democratic republic you have feudal servitude for millions of workers and unrelieved destitution?

No, wherever "democrats" are in power, you have real, barefaced robbery. We know the true nature of the so-called democracies.

The secret treaties of the French Republic, of Britain and the other democracies have clearly revealed the underlying nature and essence of this whole business. Their aims and interests are as criminal and predatory as Germany's. The war has opened our eyes, and we clearly see the barefaced robber and plunderer in the guise of the defender of the fatherland. This robbers' raid must be countered by revolutionary action, by revolutionary creative effort. True, it is not easy to achieve unity at such a difficult time, especially among the revolutionary peasants; but we believe in the creative power and public-mindedness of the industrial workers, the vanguard of the revolution. The workers are now fully aware that as long as minds are swayed by the fairy-tale of a democratic republic and a Constituent Assembly, fifty million rubles will continue to be spent daily for war purposes that are disastrous to them, and they will never secure their liberation from capitalist oppression. It was because they realised this that the workers created their Soviets.

Similarly, the realities of life have taught the workers to realise that as long as the landowners are snugly installed in their mansions and magic castles, the right of assembly will not exist, and will mean, if anything, the right to assemble only in the world to come. You will agree that to promise the workers freedom while leaving the mansions, the land, the factories and all wealth in the hands of the capitalists and landowners has hardly anything to do with liberty and equality. We have only one maxim, one slogan: All who work have the right to enjoy the benefits of life. Idlers and parasites who suck the blood of the working people must be deprived of these benefits. And we proclaim: Everything for the workers, everything for the working people!

We know how hard all this is to achieve, we know the furious resistance the bourgeoisie are putting up; but we believe in the ultimate victory of the workers, for they are bound to win if they were capable of extricating themselves from the terrible hardships of the imperialist holocaust and of erecting the edifice of socialist revolution on the ruins of the edifice they destroyed.

And, in fact, forces are uniting everywhere. Now that we have abolished private ownership of land, the workers of

town and country are rapidly coming together. And in the West, too, we see the workers' class-consciousness awakening. The British, French, Italian and other workers are making more and more appeals and demands indicating the approaching triumph of the world revolution. And our task today is to carry on our revolutionary work and to scorn the hypocrisy, the insolent outcries and lamentations of the predatory bourgeoisie. We must pit all we have on the Czech front so as to crush this whole gang who put up liberty and equality as a smokescreen to conceal the shooting down of hundreds and thousands of workers and peasants.

We have only one alternative: victory or death!

Izvestia No. 188,
September 1, 1918

Published according to
the *Izvestia* text

GREETINGS TO THE RED ARMY ON THE CAPTURE OF KAZAN

Hearty greetings to the Red Army on its wonderful victory.

May it serve as a pledge that the alliance of workers and revolutionary peasants will finish off the bourgeoisie, break down all and every resistance by the exploiters and ensure the victory of socialism all over the world.

Long live the world workers' revolution!

Lenin

Written September 11, 1918

Published September 12, 1918
in *Pravda* No. 195

Published according to
the manuscript

**LETTER TO THE PRESIDIUM OF THE CONFERENCE
OF PROLETARIAN CULTURAL AND EDUCATIONAL
ORGANISATIONS”**

17.9.18

Dear Comrades,

Many thanks for your good wishes, and the very best of luck in your work.

One of the chief conditions for the socialist revolution's victory is that the working class must realise it has to *rule* and that its rule should be carried through during the transition period from capitalism to socialism. The *rule* of the proletariat, the vanguard of all the working and exploited people, is essential in this transition period if classes are to be completely abolished, if the resistance of the exploiters is to be suppressed, and if the entire mass of the working and exploited people—crushed, downtrodden and disunited by capitalism—are to be *united* around the urban workers and brought in close alliance with them.

All our successes have been due to the workers grasping this and *governing* the state through their Soviets.

But the workers have not yet grasped this *sufficiently* and are often too *timid* in promoting *workers to governing* the state.

Fight for this, comrades! Let the proletarian cultural and educational organisations help in this. That will be a pledge of further success and the final victory of the socialist revolution.

Greetings,
V. Ulyanov (Lenin)

TELEGRAM TO OFFICER CADETS IN PETROGRAD**18.9.18****To the District Commissar, 3 Cadet Line, Vasilyevsky
Island, Petrograd**

Greetings to the 400 comrade workers who pass out today as Red Army officers and go to join the ranks. The success of the Russian and world socialist revolution depends on the degree of energy the workers display in running the state and commanding the army of working and exploited people fighting to overthrow the rule of capital. I am sure therefore that thousands and thousands of workers will follow the example of the four hundred; with such administrators and commanders the victory of communism is assured.

Lenin,
**Chairman of the Council
of People's Commissars**

Pravda No. 204,
September 19, 1918

Published according to
the manuscript

THE CHARACTER OF OUR NEWSPAPERS

Far too much space is being allotted to political agitation on outdated themes—to political ballyhoo—and far too little to the building of the new life, to the facts about it.

Why, instead of turning out 200-400 lines, don't we write twenty or even ten lines on such simple, generally known, clear topics with which the people are already fairly well acquainted, like the foul treachery of the Mensheviks—the lackeys of the bourgeoisie—the Anglo-Japanese invasion to restore the sacred rights of capital, the American multi-millionaires baring their fangs against Germany, etc., etc.? We must write about these things and note every new fact in this sphere, but we need not write long articles and repeat old arguments; what is needed is to convey in just a few lines, "in telegraphic style", the latest manifestation of the old, known and already evaluated politics.

The bourgeois press in the "good old bourgeois times" never mentioned the "holy of holies"—the conditions in privately-owned factories, in the private enterprises. This custom fitted in with the interests of the bourgeoisie. We must radically break with it. We have *not* broken with it. So far our type of newspaper has *not* changed as it should in a society in transition from capitalism to socialism.

Less politics. Politics has been "elucidated" fully and reduced to a struggle between the two camps: the insurrectionary proletariat and the handful of capitalist slaveowners (with the whole gang, right down to the Mensheviks and others). We may, and, I repeat, we must, speak very briefly about these politics.

More economics. But not in the sense of "general" discussions, learned reviews, intellectual plans and similar piffle,

for, I regret to say, they are all too often just piffle and nothing more. By economics we mean the gathering, *careful checking* and study of the facts of the actual organisation of the new life. Have *real* successes been achieved by big factories, agricultural communes, the Poor Peasants' Committees, and local Economic Councils in building up the new economy? What, precisely, are these successes? Have they been verified? Are they not fables, boasting, intellectual promises ("things are moving", "the plan has been drawn up", "we are getting under way", "we now vouch for", "there is undoubted improvement", and other charlatan phrases of which "we" are such masters)? How have the successes been achieved? What must be done to extend them?

Where is the black list with the names of the lagging factories which since nationalisation have remained models of disorder, disintegration, dirt, hooliganism and parasitism? Nowhere to be found. But there *are* such factories. We shall not be able to do our duty unless we wage *war* against these "guardians of capitalist traditions". We shall be jellyfish, not Communists, as long as we tolerate such factories. We have not learned to wage the class struggle in the newspapers as skilfully as the bourgeoisie did. Remember the skill with which it *hounded its* class enemies in the press, ridiculed them, disgraced them, and tried to sweep them away. And we? Doesn't the class struggle in the epoch of the transition from capitalism to socialism take the form of safeguarding the interests of the working *class* against the few, the groups and sections of workers who stubbornly cling to capitalist traditions and continue to regard the Soviet state in the old way: work as little and as badly as they can and grab as much money as possible from the state. Aren't there many such scoundrels, even among the compositors in Soviet printing works, among the Sormovo and Putilov workers, etc.? How many of them have we found, how many have we exposed and how many have we pilloried?

The press is silent. And if it mentions the subject at all it does so in a stereotyped, official way, not in the manner of a *revolutionary* press, not as an organ of the *dictatorship* of a class demonstrating that the resistance of the capitalists and of the parasites—the custodians of capitalist traditions—will be crushed with an iron hand.

The same with the war. Do we harass cowardly or inefficient officers? Have we denounced the really bad regiments to the whole of Russia? Have we "caught" enough of the bad types who should be removed from the army with the greatest publicity for unsuitability, carelessness, procrastination, etc.? We are not yet waging an effective, ruthless and truly revolutionary *war* against the *specific* wrongdoers. We do very little to *educate the people* by living, concrete examples and models taken from all spheres of life, although that is the chief task of the press during the transition from capitalism to communism. We give little attention to that aspect of *everyday* life inside the factories, in the villages and in the regiments where, more than anywhere else, the new is being built, where attention, publicity, public criticism, condemnation of what is bad and appeals to learn from the good are needed most.

Less political ballyhoo. Fewer highbrow discussions. Closer to life. More attention to the way in which the workers and peasants are *actually* building the *new* in their everyday work, and more *verification* so as to ascertain the extent to which the new is *communistic*.

Pravda No. 202,
September 20, 1918
Signed: *N. Lenin*

Published according to
the *Pravda* text

**TELEGRAM TO THE PENZA GUBERNIA EXECUTIVE
COMMITTEE AND THE REVOLUTIONARY
WAR COUNCIL OF THE FIRST ARMY¹¹**

Moscow 22.9.18

The capture of Simbirsk, my home town, is a wonderful tonic, the best treatment for my wounds. I feel a new lease of life and energy. Congratulations to the Red Army men on their victory, and, on behalf of all working people, thanks for all their sacrifices.

Published (without address, date and
signature) September 25, 1918 in
Petrogradskaya Pravda No. 209

Published according to
the *Petrogradskaya Pravda*
text checked with the *Krasnaya
Zvezda* text

LETTER TO RED ARMY MEN WHO TOOK PART IN THE CAPTURE OF KAZAN¹¹

Comrades,

You already know what tremendous significance Kazan's capture has acquired for the whole Russian revolution. It marked a turning-point in the soldiers' mood, their change-over to firm, resolute and victorious actions. The immense sacrifices you bore in battle are saving the Soviet Republic. The Republic's strength in the fight against the imperialists depends on the army's fortification. So does the victory of socialism in Russia and all over the world. With all my heart I greet the heroic Soviet troops, the army of the vanguard of the exploited fighting for the overthrow of the exploiters.

Comradely and communist greetings,

V. Ulyanov (Lenin)

Znamya Revolutsii (Kazan) No. 177,
September 29, 1918

Published according to
the *Znamya Revolutsii*
text

LETTER TO A JOINT SESSION
OF THE ALL-RUSSIA CENTRAL EXECUTIVE
COMMITTEE, THE MOSCOW SOVIET AND
REPRESENTATIVES OF FACTORY
COMMITTEES AND TRADE UNIONS
OCTOBER 3, 1918 ⁴⁰

Germany is in the throes of a political crisis. The panicky bewilderment both of the government and of all the exploiting classes in general has become abundantly clear to the whole people. The hopelessness of the military situation and the lack of support for the ruling classes among the working people have been exposed at one go. This crisis means either that the revolution has begun or at any rate that the people have clearly realised it is inevitable and imminent.

The government has morally resigned and is in a state of hysterical indecision, wavering between a military dictatorship and a coalition cabinet. But a military dictatorship has, virtually speaking, been under test ever since the outbreak of the war, and now it has ceased to be feasible because the army has become unreliable. And the admission of Scheidemann and Co. to the cabinet would only hasten the revolutionary outburst and make it more widespread, more conscious, more firm and determined after the thorough exposure of the pitiful impotence of these lackeys of the bourgeoisie, of these corrupt individuals, who are just like our Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries, like the Hendersons and Sidney Webbs in Britain, the Albert Thomas and Renaudels in France, and so on.

The crisis in Germany has only begun. It will inevitably end in the transfer of political power to the German proletariat.

iat. The Russian proletariat is following events with the keenest attention and enthusiasm. Now even the blindest workers in the various countries will see that the Bolsheviks were right in basing their whole tactics on the support of the world workers' revolution, and in not fearing to bear all sorts of heavy sacrifices. Today even the most ignorant will see how unspeakably vile the betrayal of socialism by the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries was when they formed an alliance with the predatory British and French bourgeoisie, ostensibly to secure the annulment of the Brest-Litovsk Peace Treaty. And the Soviet government will certainly not help the German imperialists by attempting to violate the Brest-Litovsk Peace Treaty, to tear it up at a moment when the anti-imperialist forces in Germany are beginning to seethe and boil, and when the spokesmen for the German bourgeoisie are beginning to excuse themselves to their people for having concluded such a peace treaty, and to search for a way of "changing" their policy.

But the workers of Russia are not merely following events with attention and enthusiasm. They are demanding that everything be done to *help the German workers*, who have the gravest trials ahead of them, a most difficult transition from slavery to freedom, a most stubborn *struggle against their own and British imperialism*. The defeat of German imperialism will for a while have the effect of increasing the insolence, brutality, reaction, and annexatory attempts of British and French imperialism.

The Bolshevik working class of Russia has always been internationalist in action, unlike those scoundrels, the heroes and leaders of the Second International, who either resorted to outright betrayal by forming an alliance with their bourgeoisie, or tried, by phrase-mongering and excuses (as Kautsky, Otto Bauer and Co. did), to avoid revolution, and opposed all bold and great revolutionary action, all sacrifice of narrow national interests for the sake of furthering the workers' revolution.

The Russian workers will understand that very soon they will have to make the greatest sacrifices in the cause of internationalism. The time is approaching when circumstances may require us to come to the aid of the

German people, who are struggling for their liberation from their own imperialism, against British and French imperialism.

Let us begin to prepare at once. Let us show that the Russian worker is capable of working much harder, of fighting and dying much more self-sacrificingly, when the world workers' revolution is at stake, as well as the Russian revolution.

First of all, let us multiply our efforts in storing up grain stocks. Let us resolve that every large elevator will put aside some grain to help the German workers should they be hard pressed in their struggle for emancipation from the imperialist monsters and brutes. Let every Party organisation, every trade union, every factory and workshop, etc., form special connections with several rural areas of their own selection with the object of strengthening the alliance with the peasants, helping and enlightening them, vanquishing the kulaks, and gathering up all surpluses of grain to the last ounce.

Let us, similarly, multiply our efforts in creating a proletarian Red Army. The turning-point has arrived—we all know it, we all see and feel it. The workers and labouring peasants have had a respite from the horrors of imperialist slaughter, they have realised and learnt from experience that war must be waged against the oppressors in defence of the gains of their revolution, the revolution of the working people, of their government, the Soviet government. An army is being created, a Red Army of workers and poor peasants, who are prepared to make any sacrifice in defending socialism. The army is growing in strength and is being tempered in battle with the Czechs and whiteguards. A firm foundation has been laid, and we must now hurry to erect the edifice itself.

We had decided to have an army of one million men by the spring; now we need an army of three million. We can have it. *And we shall have it.*

In these past few days world history has given tremendous momentum to the world workers' revolution. The most kaleidoscopic changes are possible, there may be attempts to form an alliance between German and Anglo-French imperialism against the Soviet government.

And we too must speed up our preparations. We must multiply our efforts.

Let this be the slogan for the anniversary of the Great October Workers' Revolution!

Let it be a pledge to the coming victories of the world workers' revolution!

N. Lenin

Pravda No. 213,
October 4, 1918

Published according to
the *Pravda* text

THE PROLETARIAN REVOLUTION AND THE RENEGADE KAUTSKY

This is the title of a pamphlet* I have begun to write in criticism of Kautsky's pamphlet, *The Dictatorship of the Proletariat*, which has just appeared in Vienna. But as this work is taking longer than I had anticipated, I have decided to ask *Pravda* to find space for a short article on the subject.

Over four years of a most exhausting and reactionary war have done their work. One can feel the impending proletarian revolution in Europe—in Austria, Italy, Germany, France and even in Britain (very significant, for example, is the article "Confessions of a Capitalist" in the July number of the arch-opportunist *Socialist Review*,⁴¹ edited by the semi-liberal Ramsay MacDonald).

And at a time like this, Mr. Kautsky, leader of the Second International, comes out with a book on the dictatorship of the proletariat—in other words, on the proletarian revolution—that is a hundred times more disgraceful, outrageous and renegade than Bernstein's notorious *Premises of Socialism*. Nearly twenty years have elapsed since the appearance of that renegade book, and now Kautsky repeats this renegacy in an even grosser form!

Only a very small part of the book deals with the Russian Bolshevik revolution as such. Kautsky repeats every one of the Mensheviks' pearls of wisdom in a way that would make the Russian worker split his sides laughing. Just imagine, for example, what goes by the name of "Marxism": the argument—peppered with quotations from the semi-liberal works by the semi-liberal Maslov—that the rich peasants are

* See present volume, pp. 227-325.—*Ed.*

trying to appropriate the land (novel!), that they find high grain prices profitable, and so on. Then our "Marxist" makes the following contemptuous, and utterly liberal, statement: "The poor peasant is recognised here [that is, by the Bolsheviks in the Soviet Republic] to be a permanent and wholesale product of the socialist agrarian reform under the 'dictatorship of the proletariat'." (P. 48 of Kautsky's pamphlet.)

Fine. Here is a socialist, a Marxist, who tries to prove to us the *bourgeois* nature of the revolution, and who at the same time scoffs at the organisation of the poor peasants, quite in the spirit of Maslov, Potresov and the *Cadets*.

"The expropriation of the rich peasants only introduces a new element of unrest and civil war into the production process, which urgently needs peace and security for its recovery." (P. 49.)

Incredible, but there we are. These are the very words, not of Savinkov or Milyukov, but of Kautsky!

Kautsky does not surprise us since we in Russia have seen so many cases of "Marxism" being used as a screen by defenders of the kulaks. For the benefit of the European reader, I should perhaps dwell in greater detail on this despicable kowtowing to the bourgeoisie and the liberal fear of civil war. But for the Russian worker and peasant it is enough to point one's finger at Kautsky's renegacy—and pass on.

* * *

Nearly nine-tenths of Kautsky's book is devoted to a general theoretical question of the utmost importance, the question of the relation between the dictatorship of the proletariat and "democracy". And it is here that Kautsky's complete break with Marxism is particularly evident.

Kautsky assures his reader—in a perfectly serious and extremely "learned" tone—that what Marx meant by "revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat" was not a "*form of governing*" that precludes democracy, but a *state*, namely, "a state of rule". And the rule of the proletariat, as the majority of the population, is possible with the strictest observance of democracy, and, for instance, the Paris Commune, which was in fact a dictatorship of the proletariat, was elected

by universal suffrage. "The fact that Marx thought that in England and America the transition [to communism] might take place peacefully, i.e., in a democratic way, proves" that when he spoke of the dictatorship of the proletariat Marx did not have in mind a "form of governing" (or a form of government, *Regierungsform*) (pp. 20-21).

Incredible, but there we are! That is exactly the way Kautsky argues and he angrily accuses the Bolsheviks of violating "democracy" in their Constitution and throughout their policy; and he takes every opportunity to energetically preach "the democratic instead of the dictatorial method".

This is a complete desertion to the opportunists (those like David, Kolb and other pillars of German social-chauvinism, or the English Fabians⁴² and Independents,⁴³ or the French and Italian reformists), who have declared more frankly and honestly that they do not accept Marx's doctrine of the dictatorship of the proletariat on the ground that it runs counter to democracy.

It is a complete reversion to the views of the pre-Marxist German socialists, who used to claim they wanted a "free people's state", to the views of the petty-bourgeois democrats, who did not understand that *every* state is a machine for the suppression of one class by another.

It is a complete renunciation of the proletarian revolution, which is replaced by the liberal theory of "winning a majority" and "utilising democracy"! Kautsky the renegade has completely forgotten, distorted and thrown overboard everything Marx and Engels taught for forty years, from 1852 to 1891, demonstrating the need for the proletariat to "smash" the bourgeois state machine.

To analyse Kautsky's theoretical mistakes in detail would mean repeating what I have said in *The State and Revolution*.* There is no need for that. I shall only say briefly:

Kautsky has renounced Marxism by forgetting that *every* state is a machine for the suppression of one class by another, and that the most *democratic* bourgeois republic is a machine for the oppression of the proletariat by the bourgeoisie.

The dictatorship of the proletariat, the proletarian state, which is a machine for the suppression of the bourgeoisie by

* See present edition, Vol. 25, pp. 381-492.—Ed.

the proletariat, is not a "form of governing", but a *state of a different type*. Suppression is necessary because the bourgeoisie will always furiously resist being expropriated.

(The argument that Marx in the seventies allowed for the possibility of a peaceful transition to socialism in England and America⁴⁴ is completely fallacious, or, to put it bluntly, dishonest in that it is juggling with quotations and references. Firstly, Marx regarded it as an exception even then. Secondly, in those days monopoly capitalism, i.e., imperialism, did not exist. Thirdly, in England and America there was no militarist clique then—as there is now—serving as the chief apparatus of the bourgeois state machine.)

You cannot have liberty, equality and so on where there is suppression. That is why Engels said: "So long as the proletariat still needs the state, it does not need it in the interests of freedom but in order to hold down its adversaries, and as soon as it becomes possible to speak of freedom the state as such ceases to exist."⁴⁵

Bourgeois democracy, which is invaluable in educating the proletariat and training it for the struggle, is always narrow, hypocritical, spurious and false; it always remains democracy for the rich and a swindle for the poor.

Proletarian democracy suppresses the exploiters, the bourgeoisie—and is therefore not hypocritical, *does not promise them* freedom and democracy—and gives the working people *genuine democracy*. Only Soviet Russia has given the proletariat and the whole vast labouring majority of Russia a *freedom and democracy* unprecedented, impossible and inconceivable in any bourgeois democratic republic, by, for example, taking the palaces and mansions away from the bourgeoisie (without which freedom of assembly is sheer hypocrisy), by taking the print-shops and stocks of paper away from the capitalists (without which freedom of the press for the nation's labouring majority is a lie), and by replacing bourgeois parliamentarism by the democratic organisation of the *Soviets*, which are a thousand times nearer to the people and more democratic than the most democratic bourgeois parliament. *And so on.*

Kautsky has thrown overboard ... the "class struggle" as applied to democracy! Kautsky has become a downright renegade and a lackey of the bourgeoisie.

* * *

I must mention, in passing, a few gems of his renegacy. Kautsky has to admit that the Soviet form of organisation is of world-wide, and not only of Russian significance, that it is one of the "most important phenomena of our times", and that it promises to acquire "decisive significance" in the future great "battles between capital and labour". But, imitating the wisdom of the Mensheviks, who have happily sided with the bourgeoisie against the proletariat, Kautsky "deduces" that the Soviets are all right as "battle organisations", but not as "state organisations".

Marvellous! Form up in Soviets, you proletarians and poor peasants! But, for God's sake, don't you dare win! Don't even think of winning! The moment you win and vanquish the bourgeoisie, that will be the end of you; for you must not be "state" organisations in a proletarian state. In fact, as soon as you have won you must break up!

What a marvellous Marxist this man Kautsky is! What an inimitable "theoretician" of renegacy!

Gem No. 2. Civil war is the "mortal enemy" of "social revolution", for, as we have already heard, the latter "needs peace [for the rich?] and security" (for the capitalists?).

Workers of Europe, don't think of revolution until you have found a bourgeoisie who *will not hire* Savinkov and Dan, Dutov and Krasnov, Czechs and kulaks to wage civil war on you!

Marx wrote in 1870 that the chief hope lay in the practice in arms that the war had given the French workers.⁴⁸ What Kautsky the "Marxist" expects of four years of war is not the use of arms by the workers against the bourgeoisie (Heaven forbid, that wouldn't really be "democratic"!), but ... the conclusion of a nice little peace by the nice little capitalists!

Gem No. 3. Civil war has another unpleasant side to it: whereas "democracy" provides for the "protection of the minority" (as—we might note in parenthesis—those in France who stood up for Dreyfus, and people like Liebknecht, Maclean or Debs in more recent times, have learned so well from their own experience), civil war (mark that!) "threatens the vanquished with complete annihilation".

Well, isn't this man Kautsky a real revolutionary? He is heart and soul for revolution ... provided there is no serious struggle threatening annihilation! He has completely "overcome" the old errors of old Engels, who so enthusiastically lauded the educational value of violent revolutions.⁴⁷ Like the "serious" historian he is, he has completely renounced the delusions of those who said that civil war steals the exploited and teaches them to build a new society *without exploiters*.

Gem No. 4. Viewed historically, was the dictatorship of the workers and petty bourgeoisie in the 1789 Revolution great and beneficial? Certainly not. For along came Napoleon. "The dictatorship of the lower sections of the population paves the way for the dictatorship of the sword" (p. 26). Like all liberals, to whose camp he has deserted, our "serious" historian is firmly convinced that in countries which have not known the "dictatorship of the lower sections"—Germany, for example—there has never been a dictatorship of the sword. Germany has never been distinguished from France by a grosser and viler dictatorship of the sword—that is all slander thought up by Marx and Engels, who brazenly lied when they said that there have so far been a greater love of freedom and a greater pride of the oppressed among the "people" in France than in England or Germany, and that it was precisely her revolutions that France has to thank for this.

...But enough! One would have to write a whole pamphlet to enumerate all the gems of renegacy of that despicable renegade Kautsky.

* * *

I must say a word or two about Mr. Kautsky's "internationalism". He inadvertently cast light upon it himself by his most sympathetic way of portraying the internationalism of the Mensheviks, who, dear Mr. Kautsky assures us, were also Zimmerwaldists⁴⁸ and, if you please, are "brothers" of the Bolsheviks!

Here is his lovely little picture of the "Zimmerwaldism" of the Mensheviks:

"The Mensheviks wanted universal peace. They wanted all those in the war to accept the slogan: no annexations

or indemnities. Until this would have been achieved, the Russian army, in their opinion, should have maintained itself in a state of fighting readiness...." But the wretched Bolsheviks "disorganised" the army and concluded the wretched Brest-Litovsk Peace Treaty.... And Kautsky says as clear as clear can be that the Constituent Assembly should have been preserved, and the Bolsheviks should not have taken power.

So internationalism means *supporting one's "own" imperialist government*, as the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries supported Kerensky, it means concealing its secret treaties, hoodwinking the people with fancy phrases, such as that we "demand" the savage beasts be tame, we "demand" the imperialist governments "accept the slogan of no annexations or indemnities".

That, in Kautsky's opinion, is internationalism.

In our opinion it is sheer renegacy.

Internationalism means breaking with *one's own social-chauvinists* (i.e., defence advocates) and with *one's own imperialist government*; it means waging a revolutionary struggle against that government and overthrowing it, and being ready to make the greatest national sacrifices (even down to a Brest-Litovsk Peace Treaty), if it should benefit the development of the *world workers' revolution*.

We all know very well that Kautsky and his friends (Ströbel, Bernstein, and the rest) were greatly "put out" by the Brest-Litovsk Peace: they would have liked us to have made a "gesture" ... that would at once have turned over power in Russia to the bourgeoisie! These dim-witted but all too nice and kind German petty bourgeois were not interested in the proletarian Soviet Republic—the first country in the world to overthrow its imperialism by revolutionary means—maintaining itself until the revolution took place in Europe, fanning the flames of the conflagration in other countries (the petty bourgeoisie *dread* a conflagration in Europe, they *dread* civil war, which would disturb "peace and security"). No, what interested them was to maintain in *all* countries the *petty-bourgeois* nationalism which calls itself "internationalism" because of its "moderation and propriety". If only the Russian Republic had remained bourgeois and ... had waited ... then everybody on earth would have

been a good, moderate, non-predatory, petty-bourgeois nationalist—and that, in fact, would have been internationalism!

That is the line of thought of the Kautskyites in Germany, the Longuetists in France, the Independents (I.L.P.) in England, Turati and his "comrades" in renegacy in Italy, and the rest of the crowd.

By now only an utter idiot can fail to see that we were not only right in overthrowing our bourgeoisie (and their lackeys, the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries), but also in concluding the Brest-Litovsk Peace Treaty *after* our open appeal for universal peace, backed by the publication and annulment of the secret treaties, had been rejected by the bourgeoisie of the Entente. In the first place, if we had not concluded the Brest-Litovsk Peace Treaty, we would at once have surrendered power to the Russian bourgeoisie and thus have done untold damage to the world socialist revolution. In the second place, at the cost of *national* sacrifices, we preserved such an *international* revolutionary influence that today we have Bulgaria directly imitating us, Austria and Germany in a state of ferment, *both* imperialist systems weakened, while we have grown stronger and *begun* to create a real proletarian army.

From the tactics of Kautsky the renegade it follows that the German workers should now defend their homeland together with the bourgeoisie and dread a German revolution most of all, for the British might impose a new edition of the Brest-Litovsk Peace on it. There's renegacy for you. There's petty-bourgeois nationalism.

We, however, say that while the loss of the Ukraine was a grave national sacrifice, it helped to steel and *strengthen* the workers and poor peasants of the Ukraine as revolutionary fighters for the world workers' revolution. The Ukraine's suffering was the world revolution's gain, for the German troops were corrupted, German imperialism was weakened, and the German, Ukrainian and Russian revolutionary workers were *drawn closer together*.

It would of course be "nicer" if we could overthrow both Wilhelm and Wilson simply by war. But that is utter nonsense. We cannot overthrow them by a war from without. But we can speed up their *internal* disintegration. We have

achieved that on an *immense* scale by the Soviet, proletarian revolution.

The German workers would do it even more successfully if they began a revolution *disregarding* national sacrifices (that alone is internationalism), if they said (and backed their word by *actions*) that they prize the interests of the world workers' revolution *higher* than the integrity, security and peace of any national state, *and of their own in particular*.

* * *

Europe's greatest misfortune and danger is that it has *no* revolutionary party. It has parties of traitors like the Scheidemanns, Renaudels, Hendersons, Webbs and Co., and of servile souls like Kautsky. But it has no revolutionary party.

Of course, a mighty, popular revolutionary movement may rectify this deficiency, but it is nevertheless a serious misfortune and a grave danger.

That is why we must do our utmost to expose renegades like Kautsky, thereby supporting the revolutionary *groups* of genuine internationalist workers, who are to be found in *all* countries. The proletariat will very soon turn away from the traitors and renegades and follow these groups, drawing and training leaders from their midst. No wonder the bourgeoisie of all countries are howling about "world Bolshevism".

World Bolshevism will conquer the world bourgeoisie.

9.10.18

Pravda No. 219, October 11, 1918
Signed: *N. Lenin*

Published according to
the manuscript

REPORT AT A JOINT SESSION OF THE ALL-RUSSIA
CENTRAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE,
THE MOSCOW SOVIET, FACTORY
COMMITTEES AND TRADE UNIONS
OCTOBER 22, 1918 ⁴⁰

(Stormy, prolonged applause and shouts of "hurrah".) Comrades, I think our present situation, for all its contradictions, might be expressed by saying, firstly, that never before have we been so near the world workers' revolution, and, secondly, that never have we been in such a perilous position. It is these two propositions, especially the second, that I want to go into today. I think the people at large scarcely realise the full danger bearing down on us, and as we can only act with popular support, the chief task of the representatives of the Soviet government is to bring home to the people the full truth of the present situation, however difficult this may sometimes be. As far as our being near the world socialist revolution is concerned, I shall be brief since it has been spoken about time and again. Indeed, one of the chief reproaches levelled at the Soviet government both by the bourgeoisie and the petty bourgeoisie who have lost faith in socialism, as well as by many so-called socialists who are used to times of peace and never did believe in socialism, is that we are taking a rash step in carrying through the socialist revolution in Russia, for the revolution in the West is not yet ripe.

Comrades, this is the fifth year of the war and the universal collapse of imperialism is as plain as can be; everyone can now see revolution must come in every country in the war. And we, who were not given more than a few days or weeks

at the beginning, have done more in this year of revolution than any proletarian party in the world has ever done. Our revolution has become a world-wide phenomenon. Even the entire bourgeoisie say that Bolshevism is a world-wide phenomenon. This admission goes to show that our revolution has spread from the East to the West and is falling on more and more receptive soil. You know that revolution has flared up in Bulgaria. The Bulgarian soldiers have begun to form Soviets. And now news has come that Soviets are being set up in Serbia too. Even though the Anglo-French Entente is promising the peoples thousands of blessings if they rebel and break with Germany, even though the capitalists of America, Britain and France, the richest and most powerful in the world, are so lavish with their promises, it is becoming obvious that the bourgeoisie of the various small countries into which Austria is now disintegrating cannot hold out under any circumstances, that their rule and power in these countries will be short-lived and transitory, for the workers' revolution is knocking on the door everywhere.

The bourgeoisie of individual countries know that the only way they can hold on to power in their states is with the help of foreign bayonets. And we see that revolution has begun not only in Austria, but even in Germany, both of whose positions seemed so stable only a little while ago. News has come that the German press is already talking about the Kaiser's abdication and that the press of the Independent Social-Democratic Party⁵⁰ has already received permission from the Chancellor to talk about a German republic. That certainly is something. We know demoralisation is increasing among the troops and that there are direct appeals for an army mutiny. We know that revolutionary military committees have been set up in Eastern Germany and that they are issuing revolutionary publications which are stirring up the soldiers. There is therefore every justification to say that revolution is growing in leaps and bounds. And we are not the only ones to say so; it is being said by all Germans in the war party and among the bourgeoisie who feel that the ministers are tottering, that the people do not trust them, and that they and their government will not hold on much longer. That is what everybody who knows anything about the state of affairs is saying, which just goes to show how inevitable a

popular revolution, and perhaps a proletarian revolution, has become in Germany.

We know very well what an immense workers' movement has sprung up in other countries as well. We saw how Gompers went to Italy and, with Entente money and the help of all the Italian bourgeoisie and social-patriots, toured every town in Italy calling upon the Italian workers to carry on the imperialist war. We saw how the Italian socialist papers wrote articles about this in which all that was left was Gompers's name, after the censor had deleted everything else; or articles which jeered: "Gompers is banqueting and tongue-wagging." And the bourgeois papers admitted Gompers was hissed everywhere. The bourgeois papers wrote: "The Italian workers are behaving as if they would allow only Lenin and Trotsky to tour Italy." During the war the Italian Socialist Party⁵¹ has made tremendous strides forward, that is, to the left. We know there have been too many patriots among the workers in France; they were told that Paris and French territory were in grave danger. But there, too, the workers' attitude is changing. There were cries of "Hurrah for the Socialist Republic!" at the last congress,⁵² when a letter was read about what the Allies, the British and French imperialists, were doing. And yesterday news was received that a meeting had been held in Paris attended by two thousand metalworkers, which hailed the Soviet Republic in Russia. We see that of the three socialist parties in Great Britain,⁵³ only one, the Independent Socialist Party, is not openly supporting the Bolsheviks, whereas the British Socialist Party and the Socialist Labour Party of Scotland have definitely proclaimed their support for the Bolsheviks. Bolshevism is also beginning to spread in Britain. And the Spanish parties are hailing the Russian Bolsheviks at their congresses⁵⁴ although they had formerly sided with British and French imperialism and had had only one or two men on the outbreak of the war with even a remote conception of what internationalists were. Bolshevism has become the world-wide theory and tactics of the international proletariat! (Applause.) It has accomplished a thoroughgoing socialist revolution for all the world to see. To be for or against the Bolsheviks is actually the dividing line among socialists. As a result of what Bolshevism has done, a programme for

the creation of a workers' state is the vital question of the day. Workers who had no idea of what was going on in Russia, because they only read the bourgeois papers which were full of lies and slander, began to realise, on seeing the workers' government winning one victory after another over its counter-revolutionaries, that our tactics and the revolutionary form of action of our workers' government was the only way out of this war. Last Wednesday there was a demonstration in Berlin, and the workers expressed their disgust with the Kaiser by trying to march past his palace; then they proceeded to the Russian Embassy to express their solidarity with the actions of the Russian Government.

That is what Europe has come to in this fifth year of war! That is why we say we have never been so near the world revolution, it has never been so obvious that the Russian workers have established their might. It is clear that millions and scores of millions of workers of the world will follow our example. That is why, I repeat, we have never been so near the world revolution, and never have we been in such a perilous position, because this is the first time Bolshevism has been regarded as a world force. It had seemed to be only a result of the fatigue of the Russian soldiers, an outburst of discontent on the part of the war-weary Russian soldiers; it had seemed that as soon as this discontent had passed and peace had been established, even a peace of the most coercive character, all steps towards building a new state and towards socialist reforms would have been crushed. Everyone had been certain of that, but it turned out that as soon as we emerged from the imperialist war, which ended in very harsh peace terms, to take the first steps in building our state, as soon as we were able to give the peasants a real chance of living without landowners, of establishing relations against the landowners, and of convincing themselves in practice that they were building their own lives on the expropriated land, really for the labouring people and not for the kulaks or the new capitalists; as soon as the workers saw they had a chance to build their lives without capitalists and learn that difficult but great business without which they will never escape from exploitation—it became obvious to all, and was shown in practice, that no force, no counter-revolution could overthrow the Soviet government.

It took months before we in Russia arrived at this conviction. It is said that in the countryside it was only in the summer of 1918, only towards autumn, that the peasants came to realise the meaning and significance of our revolution. In the town this was realised some time ago, but it took many a long month for it to reach every district, every remote rural area and village, for the peasant to see from his own experience, not from books or speeches, that the land has to go to those who till it, and not to the kulak, and that the kulak has to be fought, has to be defeated by organisation, that the revolts which swept over the country this summer were supported by the landowners, kulaks and whiteguards; to learn from his own bitter experience, at his own cost, what the rule of the Constituent Assembly meant. And now, the countryside is emerging steeled and tempered, and the mass of poor peasants, who do not exploit the labour of others, have only now learnt from their own experience, not from books, from which the working people will never derive firm convictions, that Soviet government means the government of the exploited working people, and that now every village can proceed to lay the foundations of a new, socialist Russia.

It took many long months for us to be able to say with conviction, basing ourselves on the reports of people with practical experience, that after 1918 in the rest of Russia, too, in every village, however remote, the people know what Soviet government means and uphold it. For the peasants have seen what a menace the capitalists and landowners are. They have also seen the difficulties of the socialist transformation, yet were not deterred; they said: "We shall put our millions of hands to this work; we have learnt a lot in a year, and we shall learn even more." This is what scores of millions in Russia are now saying with full conviction, on the basis of their own experience.

This is just getting through to the West-European bourgeoisie as well. Up to now they had not taken the Bolsheviks seriously; now they begin to realise that the only stable form of state has been set up here, a state which works hand in hand with the working people and can rouse them to real heroic self-sacrifice. And when this workers' state began to infect Europe, it turned out that this was by no means something peculiar to Russia alone, and that four years of

war had caused demoralisation of the armies all over the world. Before, they used to say that owing to her backwardness and inefficiency, only Russia had reached such a stage when her army had fallen to pieces in the fourth year of war, and that this could never happen in civilised, parliamentary countries.

Now, however, everybody can see that after four years of world war, when millions have been slaughtered and crippled for the profit of the capitalists, and when there are tens of thousands of deserters, this extraordinary thing is happening in Austria as well as Russia, and even in Germany, which boasts of her good order. When that happened, the world bourgeoisie realised they had to contend with a more serious enemy, and they began to rally together; and the nearer we approached the world workers' revolution, the more the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie rallied together.

In some countries people are still ignoring revolution, just as in October the coalition ministers ignored the Bolsheviks and said Russia would never fall under Bolshevik rule. In France, for example, they say the Bolsheviks are a gang of traitors who are selling their people to the Germans. The French bourgeoisie are more to be excused for saying that than the Left Socialist-Revolutionaries, for it is only to be expected that the bourgeoisie will spend millions on fabricating lies. But when the French bourgeoisie saw Bolshevism developing in France and even non-revolutionary parties backing the Bolsheviks with revolutionary slogans, they saw they were confronted with a more formidable enemy—the collapse of imperialism and the superiority of the workers in the revolutionary struggle.

Everyone knows that the danger to the workers' revolution is particularly great just now owing to the imperialist war, because the workers' revolution develops unevenly in different countries, since the conditions of political life differ. In one country the proletariat is too weak and in another it is stronger. In one country the top section of workers is weak, and in other countries the bourgeoisie are able to split the ranks of the workers for a time as was the case in Britain and France. That is why the workers' revolution develops unevenly, and that is why the bourgeoisie

recognised that their most powerful enemy is the revolutionary proletariat. They are rallying together to ward off the collapse of world imperialism.

Now our situation has changed and events are moving tremendously fast. At first there were two groups of imperialist marauders who tried to annihilate each other, but now they see—especially by the example of German imperialism, which had only recently considered itself the match of Britain and France—that their chief enemy is the revolutionary proletariat. Now, when Germany is being torn apart by the revolutionary movement at home, the British and French imperialists consider themselves masters of the world. They are convinced their chief enemy is the Bolsheviks and the world revolution. The more the revolution develops, the more the bourgeoisie rally together. That is why some of us, and many especially among the people at large, who are now convinced they can defeat our counter-revolutionaries—the Cossacks, officers and Czechs—and think that settles everything, do not realise this is not enough for us now, that there is a new enemy, a far more formidable one: British and French imperialism. So far this enemy has not had very much success in Russia, as, for example, in the case of the Archangel landing. A French writer who published a newspaper called *La Victoire*⁵⁵ said that victory over the Germans was not enough for France, that she also needed victory over Bolshevism, and that the campaign against Russia was not an attack on Germany, but a campaign against the Bolshevik revolutionary proletariat and against the contagion that is spreading all over the world.

That is why a new danger has appeared, a danger which has not yet fully developed and is not yet fully apparent, a danger which the British and French imperialists are plotting surreptitiously and which we must clearly realise so as to open the people's eyes to it through their leaders. For although it is true the British and French have not achieved any great success in Siberia or in Archangel—in fact they have suffered a number of setbacks—they are now directing their efforts for an attack on Russia from the South, either through the Dardanelles and the Black Sea, or else overland, through Bulgaria and Rumania. As they keep their moves a military secret, we cannot tell how far advanced

the preparations for this campaign are, and which of the two plans, or perhaps even a third, has been selected; there lies the danger, for we cannot know for certain. But we do know absolutely for certain that these preparations are being made, for the newspapers of these countries are not always very cautious, and now and again some journalist openly announces the chief aims, and discards all the false talk about a league of nations.

Among the German ruling circles, we now clearly perceive two tendencies, two plans of salvation—if salvation is still possible. Some say: Let us play for time and keep going until spring, and perhaps we may yet be able to put up military resistance along the fortified line. Others see their chief hope of salvation in Britain and France; they concentrate on reaching an agreement with Britain and France against the Bolsheviks; their attention is centred on this. And while it is true that Wilson now replies to peace overtures with a blunt and contemptuous refusal, this is scarcely enough to induce the party of the German capitalists who are seeking agreement with Britain to renounce their plans. They know that agreements are sometimes reached tacitly, and that they may be rewarded if they are of service to the British and French capitalists against the Bolsheviks. In capitalist society they do pay for services rendered. They think: "Perhaps if we help the British and French capitalists grab something, they will leave a portion of the spoils for us." One good turn deserves another—such are the ethics of the capitalist world. And I think that in laying claim to a certain share of British and French capital, these people know what they are up to and are counting on billions, no less. Some of these gentlemen are past masters at this sort of calculations.

A tacit bargain has most definitely been struck between the German bourgeoisie and that of the Entente powers. The gist of it is that the British and French say to the Germans: "We shall get to the Ukraine, but don't withdraw your troops until our occupational forces arrive, otherwise the workers will take power and the Soviet government will triumph there too." That is the way they reason, for they realise that the bourgeoisie of all the occupied countries—Finland, the Ukraine, Poland—know they cannot hold out for a single day if the German army of occupation withdraws. And

that is why the bourgeoisie of these countries—which yesterday sold themselves to the Germans, went cap in hand to the German imperialists and concluded an alliance with them against their own workers, just as the Ukrainian Mensheviks did and the Socialist-Revolutionaries did in Tiflis—are now ready to sell their country to anybody. Yesterday they sold it to the Germans, and today they are selling it to the British and French. That is the sort of bargaining going on behind the scenes. Seeing that the British and French bourgeoisie are winning, they are all going over to them and preparing to make a deal with the British and French imperialists against us and at our expense.

When they tell their future Anglo-French multimillionaire master they are siding with him, they say: "Your Excellency will defeat the Bolsheviks, you must help us, because the Germans will not save us." This conspiracy by the bourgeoisie of all countries against the revolutionary workers and the Bolsheviks is increasingly taking shape and becoming openly blatant. And it is our direct duty to indicate this danger to the workers and peasants of all countries in the war.

Take the Ukraine as an example. Imagine her position and what the workers and intelligent Communists must do in the present situation. On the one hand they see the indignation against the German imperialists, against the dreadful plunder of the Ukraine, and on the other they see that some of the German troops, the greater part perhaps, have been withdrawn. They may think of giving vent to their pent-up hatred and resentment by attacking the German imperialists at once, regardless of everything. But others say: "We are internationalists, we must look at things from the point of view both of Russia and of Germany; even from Germany's point of view we know that the government there cannot hold out; we are firmly convinced that if the victory of the workers and peasants in the Ukraine is accompanied by the consolidation and success of the government of Russia, then socialist proletarian Ukraine will not only win but will be invincible!" Such intelligent Ukrainian Communists say: We must be very cautious. Tomorrow we may have to exert every effort and stake everything in the struggle against imperialism and the German troops. That may be so for tomorrow, but not for today; and today we know that the troops of the

German imperialists are being demoralised, we know that beside the Ukrainian troops, the East-Prussian and German troops are publishing revolutionary literature.⁵⁶ At the same time, our chief task is to carry on propaganda for a revolt in the Ukraine. That is correct from the standpoint of the world revolution because Germany is the main link in this chain, since the German revolution is already ripe; and the success of the world revolution most of all depends on it.

We shall take care that our interference will not harm their revolution. One must understand the changes and growth of every revolution. The revolution proceeds in its own way in every country—we ought to know after seeing and experiencing it—and these ways are so diverse that it may be delayed for a year or two. World revolution is not so smooth as to proceed in the same way everywhere, in all countries. If it were, we should have been victorious long ago. Every country has to go through definite political stages. Everywhere we find the compromisers making the same efforts, the same attempts "to save the people from the bourgeoisie"—in conjunction with the bourgeoisie. Tsereteli and Chernov did it here, and the Scheidemannites are doing it in Germany; in France they are doing it in their own way. And now that the revolution is making its way into Germany, the country where the workers' movement is strongest, and where it is distinguished for its organisation and endurance, where the workers have been patient longest of all—but perhaps have accumulated more revolutionary hatred and are better able to settle scores with their enemies—interference in these events by people who do not know how fast the revolution is growing may hamper those intelligent Communists who say: "My prime purpose is to make this a deliberate process." Now that the German soldier has seen that he is being driven to the slaughter on the pretext that he is going to defend his country, while in fact going to defend the German imperialists, the time is coming when the revolution will break out in Germany with such force and organisation as to solve a hundred international problems. That is why intelligent Ukrainian Communists say: "We must make every sacrifice for the victory of the world revolution, but we should realise that the future depends on us and we must march in step with the German revolution."

Those are the difficulties I wanted to point out, using the reasoning of the Ukrainian Communists as an example. These difficulties also affect Soviet Russia's position. We can now say that the workers of the world have awoken and are making immense strides; but this makes our position all the more difficult, for our "ally" of yesterday is attacking us as his chief enemy. He is now out to fight international Bolshevism, not hostile armies. Now that Krasnov's troops are mustering on the Southern Front (and we know they have received ammunition from the Germans), now that we have exposed imperialism in the eyes of the world, the people who blamed us for the Brest-Litovsk Peace and sent Krasnov to get ammunition from the Germans with which to bombard the Russian workers and peasants, are currently getting ammunition from the British and French imperialists, auctioning off Russia to the highest millionaire bidder. That is why our general conviction that a change has set in is now not enough. We have our old enemies, and behind them new forces are now rallying to their aid. We know and see all that. Six months ago, in February or March, we had no army. The army could not fight. The army which had been through four years of imperialist war, without knowing what it was fighting for, but vaguely feeling that it was fighting in the interests of others, that army took to its heels, and no force on earth could stop it.

No revolution is worth anything unless it can defend itself; but a revolution does not learn to defend itself at once. The revolution has awakened millions to a new life. In February and March these millions did not know why they were being sent to continue the slaughter to which the tsars and the Kerenskys had driven them, and whose aim was exposed by the Bolshevik Government only in December. All they knew was that it was not their war, and nearly six months were required before a turn in the tide. This turn has now come; it is changing the force of the revolution. In February and March, the people, exhausted and tormented by four years of war, abandoned everything and said there must be peace and the war terminated. They were in no state to ask what the war was about. If these people have now created a new discipline in the Red Army, not the discipline of the rod and of the landowner but the discipline of the Soviets of Workers' and Peasants' Deputies; if they are now

ready to make the greatest sacrifices; if a new unity has sprung up among them, it is because for the first time a new discipline, a socialist discipline, has been born in the minds and experience of tens of millions, a Red Army has been born. It was born only when these tens of millions of people saw from their own experience that they had overthrown the landowners and capitalists, that a new life was being built, that they had begun to build it themselves, and that they would get it built if they were not prevented by foreign invasion.

When the peasants saw who their chief enemy was and began the struggle against the village kulaks, when the workers overthrew the manufacturers and began to organise the factories in accordance with a proletarian principle of national economy, they saw all the difficulty this work of reorganisation entailed, but they proved equal to the task. It took months to get things going. These months have passed, and the turn has come. Gone is the time when we were impotent. We have begun to advance with giant strides. Gone is the time when we had no army and no discipline; a new discipline has been created, and new people are joining the army and laying down their lives by the thousand.

That means that the new discipline, the comradely alliance, has re-educated us in the struggle at the front and in the struggle in the countryside against the kulak. This turning-point has been a difficult one, but now we feel that things are beginning to move, and that we are passing from unorganised, decree-made socialism to true socialism. The chief task facing us is to fight imperialism, and this fight we must win. We make no secret of all the difficulty and danger this fight entails. We know that the tide of feeling has changed in the Red Army; it has begun to win victories, it is promoting from its ranks thousands of officers who have been through training courses in the new proletarian military colleges and thousands of other officers who have been through no other training than the hard training of war. Thus, without the least exaggeration, and fully recognising the danger, we can now say that we have an army; and this army has created discipline and has achieved fighting efficiency. Our Southern Front is not just a front—it is a front against British and French imperialism, against the

most powerful foe in the world. But we are not afraid, for we know the foe will be unable to cope with its own enemy at home.

Three months ago, people used to laugh when we said there might be a revolution in Germany. They said that only half-crazy Bolsheviks could believe in a German revolution. Not only the entire bourgeoisie, but the Mensheviks and Left Socialist-Revolutionaries as well, called the Bolsheviks traitors to patriotism and said that revolution in Germany was impossible. But we knew that our help was needed there, and that to render that help we had to sacrifice everything and consent even to the most onerous terms of peace. That was how these people were talking and trying to prove their point to us only a few months ago, but in these few months Germany, from a mighty empire, has become a rotten hulk. The force which has corroded it is operating in America and England as well; today it is weak, but with every step the British and French try to take in Russia, with every step they try to take to occupy the Ukraine, as the Germans did, this force will loom larger and larger and become even more formidable than the Spanish 'flu.

That, comrades, is why I repeat that the chief task of every class-conscious worker now is to reveal the whole truth, not to conceal anything from the people, who may not fully realise the acuteness of the situation. The workers are mature enough to be told the truth. We have to defeat world imperialism as well as the whiteguards. We have to defeat, and we shall defeat, not only that enemy, but an enemy even more formidable. And for this we need the Red Army more than anything else. Every organisation in Soviet Russia must always give its prime attention to the army. Today, when everything is clear, the war and the strengthening of the army must take first place. We are absolutely confident we shall cope with the counter-revolution. We know we have the forces, but we also know that British and French imperialism is stronger than we are, and we want the working people to realise this quite clearly. We say that the army must be ten times stronger, and more; we must go on strengthening discipline, and every class-conscious, enlightened, organised and genuine leader must show ten times more attention and concern for this. Then this growth of the world revolution will

not be confined to the defeated countries. Revolution is now beginning in the victor countries as well. Our forces must grow daily, and this constant growth is, as it was, our chief and complete guarantee that world socialism will triumph! (*Comrade Lenin's speech is repeatedly interrupted by loud applause and ends in ovation. All rise and greet the leader of the world revolution.*)

Newspaper reports published
October 23, 1918 in *Pravda* No. 229
and *Izvestia* No. 231

Published in full in 1919
in the book *All-Russia
Central Executive Committee,
Fifth Convocation. Verbatim
Report, Moscow*

Published according to the
book checked
with the verbatim report and
the newspaper texts

RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT A JOINT SESSION
OF THE ALL-RUSSIA CENTRAL EXECUTIVE
COMMITTEE, THE MOSCOW SOVIET, FACTORY
COMMITTEES AND TRADE UNIONS
OCTOBER 22, 1918

The proletarian and peasant revolutionary movement against the imperialist war has recently had tremendous successes in all countries, especially in the Balkans, Austria and Germany. These successes, however, have particularly embittered the international bourgeoisie, now headed by the Anglo-American and French bourgeoisie, and have forced them to make hasty efforts to organise themselves as a counter-revolutionary force for crushing the revolution and, above all, for crushing Soviet power in Russia, which is the chief hotbed of revolution at present.

The German bourgeoisie and the German Government, defeated in the war and threatened by a mighty revolutionary movement from within, are threshing about in their search for salvation. One trend in the ruling circles of Germany still hopes by delays to gain time before the winter and to prepare for the country's military defence on a new line of fortifications. Another trend is feverishly seeking agreement with the Anglo-French bourgeoisie against the revolutionary proletariat and the Bolsheviks. Since this trend is running up against the flat refusal of the victors, the Anglo-French imperialists, to strike a bargain, it is trying to frighten them with the Bolshevik danger and bribe them by offering its services against the Bolsheviks, against the proletarian revolution.

The bourgeoisie of the countries subordinated to Germany or occupied by her are still more eagerly seeking agreement

with the Entente, especially in those cases—as, for example, in Finland, the Ukraine, etc.—where they are aware that it is completely impossible for them to maintain power over the exploited working people without the aid of foreign bayonets.

Owing to these circumstances, Soviet power finds itself in the following peculiar situation: on the one hand, we have never been so close to an international proletarian revolution as we are now; on the other hand, we have never been in such a perilous position as we are now. There are no longer two approximately equal groups of imperialist plunderers, devouring and weakening each other. There remains a single group of victors, the Anglo-French imperialists, which intends to divide the whole world among the capitalists. It intends to overthrow Soviet power in Russia at all costs and replace it by bourgeois power. It is preparing now to attack Russia from the South, through the Dardanelles and the Black Sea, for example, or through Bulgaria and Rumania. Moreover, at least a part of the Anglo-French imperialists evidently hope that the German Government, by a direct or tacit agreement with them, will withdraw its troops from the Ukraine only as the latter becomes occupied by Anglo-French troops, so as not to allow the otherwise inevitable victory of the Ukrainian workers and peasants and their establishment of a Ukrainian workers' and peasants' government.

Behind the back of the Krasnov and whiteguard counter-revolutionaries, preparations are being made for an attack against us by a much more dangerous force, the force of the international counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie, with the Anglo-American and French bourgeoisie in first place. This is a fact that is not realised everywhere and the awareness of which has not penetrated deep down among the broad mass of the workers and peasants. We must therefore tirelessly imbue this awareness in the people. The most assiduous attention must be devoted to strengthening the Southern Front and establishing and arming an incomparably mightier Red Army than we have now. Every workers' organisation, every union of poor peasants, every Soviet institution must again and again give priority to the question of strengthening the army, and repeatedly re-examine whether we have done

enough, and what new measures we could and should undertake.

A marked change has taken place in the mood of our workers and peasants. The people have overcome their extreme war-weariness. An army is being created and has been created. A new, communist discipline, a class-conscious discipline of the working people, has developed. And this fact gives us every reason to confidently expect that we can and will defend our socialist homeland and secure the victory of the international proletarian revolution.

Izvestia No. 231,
October 23, 1918

Published according to
the manuscript

**SPEECH AT A RALLY IN HONOUR OF
THE AUSTRO-HUNGARIAN REVOLUTION
NOVEMBER 3, 1918**

BRIEF NEWSPAPER REPORT

(Storm of applause.) Events have shown that the people's sufferings have not been in vain.

We are not only fighting Russian capitalism. We are fighting the capitalism of all countries, world capitalism—we are fighting for the freedom of all workers.

Hard as it was for us to cope with famine and our enemies, we now see that we have millions of allies.

They are the workers of Austria, Hungary and Germany. While we are gathered here, Friedrich Adler is very likely on his way to Vienna after his release from prison. The first day of the Austrian workers' revolution is probably being celebrated on the squares of Vienna.

The time is near when the first day of the world revolution will be celebrated everywhere.

Our labour and sufferings have not been in vain! The world revolution will triumph!

Long live the world proletarian revolution! *(Storm of applause.)*

Pravda No. 240,
November 5, 1918.

Published according to
the *Pravda* text

SPEECH AT A CEREMONIAL MEETING
OF THE ALL-RUSSIA CENTRAL
AND MOSCOW TRADE UNION COUNCILS
NOVEMBER 6, 1918⁵⁷

NEWSPAPER REPORT

(Those present rise and greet Comrade Lenin with stormy, prolonged applause.) People today are gathering at hundreds of meetings to celebrate the anniversary of the October Revolution. To those who have been in the workers' movement for some time, who were connected with the workers in the old days, and who had close contacts with the factories, it is clear that this past year has been one of genuine proletarian dictatorship. This concept used to be mysterious book Latin, a mouthful of incomprehensible words. Intellectuals sought an explanation of the concept in learned works, which only gave them a hazy notion of what the proletarian dictatorship was all about. The chief thing that stands to our credit during this past year is that we have translated these words from abstruse Latin into plain Russian. During this past year the working class has not been engaged in idle philosophising, but in the practical work of creating and exercising a proletarian dictatorship, despite the excited mental state of the intellectuals.

Capitalism still rules the roost in the West. But now the day of great upheavals is dawning there too. Today the West-European workers, too, are approaching the difficult period of transition from capitalism to socialism. They, like ourselves, will have to smash the entire old apparatus and build a new one.

We have not been able to utilise the whole store of experience, knowledge and technical training the bourgeois intel-

lectuals had. The bourgeoisie sneered at the Bolsheviks and said the Soviet government would scarcely hold out for a fortnight; so they not only shirked co-operation, but wherever they could and with every means in their power put up resistance to the new movement, the new construction which was destroying the old order.

The resistance of the bourgeoisie has by no means ceased. It is growing more vindictive every day; the nearer the end of the old capitalist world approaches, the faster it grows.

Due to Bolshevism's growing strength and the world-wide dimensions it is assuming, the international situation today could well cause an alliance of imperialists of all shades to attack the Soviet Republic; then bourgeois resistance would be international rather than national.

Germany, as you know, has expelled our Ambassador from Berlin on the pretext that our mission in Germany was conducting revolutionary propaganda. As if the German Government did not know before that our Embassy was a carrier of the revolutionary contagion. If Germany said nothing about it before, it was because she was still strong and not afraid of us. But now, after her military collapse, she has begun to dread us. The German generals and capitalists are turning to the Allies and saying: "You may have beaten us, but don't carry your experiments on us too far, for we are both menaced by world Bolshevism; and we might be useful in the fight against it."

It is quite possible that the Allied imperialists may unite with the German imperialists for a joint campaign against Russia, provided, of course, the German imperialists still survive. That is why the danger that has surrounded us all through the past year is now looming larger than ever. But now we are not alone. We now have friends in the people who have already rebelled and those who are about to rebel and who are making it plain enough to their governments that they refuse to go on fighting for rapacious aims. Although a new stretch of very dangerous periods lies ahead, we shall continue our socialist construction. Past experience will help us avoid mistakes and lend us fresh strength in our further work.

The part played by the trade unions in the building of a new apparatus has been tremendous. The working class has

shown that it is capable of organising industry without intellectuals or capitalists. Much has been done, but much still remains to be done. Comrades, carry on boldly along the path you have been following, and get more and more people to join in the work! Give all workers who are connected with the people and sincerely want the new system to take firm root, even though they may be illiterate, inexperienced and untrained—give them all, whether Party members or not, a chance to work and learn in the new proletarian state, to govern and create wealth.

The workers of the world will rise up, overthrow capitalism everywhere and consummate our work, which will lead to the complete victory of socialism! (Stormy applause.)

Izvestia No. 244,
November 9, 1918

Published according to
the *Izvestia* text

***EXTRAORDINARY SIXTH
ALL-RUSSIA CONGRESS OF SOVIETS
OF WORKERS', PEASANTS', COSSACKS'
AND RED ARMY DEPUTIES"***

NOVEMBER 6-9, 1918

1

SPEECH ON THE ANNIVERSARY OF THE REVOLUTION
NOVEMBER 6

(Comrade Lenin's appearance in the hall is greeted with prolonged ovation.) Comrades, we are celebrating the anniversary of our revolution at a time when events of the utmost importance are taking place in the international working-class movement. It has become obvious even to the most sceptical and doubting elements of the working class and working people in general that the world war will end neither by agreements nor by coercion on the part of the old government and the old ruling bourgeois class, that this war is leading the whole world as well as Russia to a world proletarian revolution and to the workers' triumph over capital. Capital drenched the earth in blood, and, after the violence and outrages of German imperialism, Anglo-French imperialism, supported by Austria and Germany, is pursuing the same policy.

Today, when celebrating the anniversary of the revolution, it is fitting that we cast a glance back along the path traversed by the revolution. We began our revolution in unusually difficult conditions, such as no other workers' revolution in the world will ever have to face. It is therefore particularly important that we endeavour to review the path we have covered as a whole, to take stock of our achievements during this period, and see to what extent we have prepared ourselves during the past year for our chief, our real, our decisive and fundamental task. We must be one of the detachments, one of the units of the world proletarian and socialist army. We have always realised that it

was not on account of any merit of the Russian proletariat, or because it was in advance of the others, that we happened to begin the revolution, which grew out of world-wide struggle. On the contrary, it was only because of the peculiar weakness and backwardness of capitalism, and the peculiar pressure of military strategic circumstances, that we happened in the course of events to move ahead of the other detachments, while not waiting until they had caught us up and rebelled. We are now making this review so as to take stock of our preparations for the battles that will face us in the coming revolution.

And so, comrades, when we ask ourselves what big changes we have made over the past year, we can say the following: from workers' control, the working class's first steps, and from disposing of all the country's resources, we are now on the threshold of creating a workers' administration of industry; from the general peasants' struggle for land, the peasants' struggle against the landowners, a struggle that had a national, bourgeois-democratic character, we have now reached a stage where the proletarian and semi-proletarian elements in the countryside have set themselves apart: those who labour and are exploited have set themselves apart from the others and have begun to build a new life; the most oppressed country folk are fighting the bourgeoisie, including their own rural kulak bourgeoisie, to the bitter end.

Furthermore, from the first steps of Soviet organisation we have now reached a stage where, as Comrade Sverdlov justly remarked in opening this Congress, there is no place in Russia, however remote, where Soviet authority has not asserted itself and become an integral part of the Soviet Constitution, which is based on long experience gained in the struggle of the working and oppressed people.

We now have a powerful Red Army instead of being utterly defenceless after the last four years' war, which evoked hatred and aversion among the mass of the exploited and left them terribly weak and exhausted, and which condemned the revolution to a most difficult and drastic period when we were defenceless against the blows of German and Austrian imperialism. Finally, and most important of all, we have come from being isolated internationally, from which

we suffered both in October and at the beginning of the year, to a position where our only, but firm allies, the working and oppressed people of the world, have at last rebelled. We have reached a stage where the leaders of the West-European proletariat, like Liebknecht and Adler, leaders who spent many months in prison for their bold and heroic attempts to gather opposition to the imperialist war, have been set free under the pressure of the rapidly developing workers' revolutions in Vienna and Berlin. Instead of being isolated, we are now in a position where we are marching side by side, shoulder to shoulder with our international allies. Those are the chief achievements of the past year. I want to say a few words about the road we have covered, about this transitional stage.

At first our slogan was workers' control. We said that despite all the promises of the Kerensky government, the capitalists were continuing to sabotage production and increase dislocation. We can now see that this would have ended in complete collapse. So the first fundamental step that every socialist, workers' government has to take is workers' control. We did not decree socialism immediately throughout industry, because socialism can only take shape and be consolidated when the working class has learnt how to run the economy and when the authority of the working people has been firmly established. Socialism is mere wishful thinking without that. That is why we introduced workers' control, appreciating that it was a contradictory and incomplete measure, but an essential one so that the workers themselves might tackle the momentous tasks of building up industry in a vast country without and opposed to exploiters.

Everyone who took a direct, or even indirect, part in this work, everyone who lived through all the oppression and brutality of the old capitalist regime, learned a great deal. We know that little has been accomplished. We know that in this extremely backward and impoverished country where innumerable obstacles and barriers were put in the workers' way, it will take them a long time to learn to run industry. But we consider it most important and valuable that the workers have themselves tackled the job, and that we have passed from workers' control, which in all the main branches

of industry was bound to be chaotic, disorganised, primitive and incomplete, to workers' industrial administration on a national scale.

The trade unions' position has altered. Their main function now is to send their representatives to all management boards and central bodies, to all the new organisations which have taken over a ruined and deliberately sabotaged industry from capitalism. They have coped with industry without the assistance of those intellectuals who from the very outset deliberately used their knowledge and education—the result of mankind's store of knowledge—to frustrate the cause of socialism, rather than assist the people in building up a socially-owned economy without exploiters. These men wanted to use their knowledge to put a spoke in the wheel, to hamper the workers who were least trained for tackling the job of administration.

We can now say that the main hindrance has been removed. It was extremely difficult, but the sabotage of all people gravitating towards the bourgeoisie has been checked. The workers have succeeded in taking this basic step, in laying the foundations of socialism, despite tremendous handicaps. We are not exaggerating and are not afraid to tell the truth. It is true that in terms of our ultimate goal, little has been accomplished. But a great deal, a very great deal, has been done to strengthen the foundations. When speaking of socialism, we cannot say that great sections of workers have laid the foundations in a politically-conscious way in the sense that they have taken to reading books and pamphlets. By political consciousness we mean that they have tackled this formidable task with their own hands and by their own efforts. And they have committed thousands of blunders from each of which they have themselves suffered. But every blunder trained and steeled them in organising industrial administration, which has now been established and put upon a firm foundation. They saw their work through. From now on the work will be different, for now all workers, not just the leaders and advanced workers, but great sections of workers, know that they themselves, with their own hands, are building socialism and have already laid its foundations, and no force in the country can prevent them from seeing the job through.

We may have had great difficulties in industry, where we had to cover a road which to many seemed long, but which was actually short and led from workers' control to workers' administration, yet far greater preparatory work had to be done in the more backward countryside. Anyone who has studied rural life and come into contact with the peasants would say that it was only in the summer and autumn of 1918 that the urban October Revolution became a real rural October Revolution. And the Petrograd workers and the Petrograd garrison soldiers fully realised when they took power that great difficulties would crop up in rural organisational work, and our progress there would have to be more gradual and that it would be the greatest folly to try to introduce socialised farming by decree, for only an insignificant number of enlightened peasants might support us, while the vast majority had no such object in view. We therefore confined ourselves to what was absolutely essential in the interests of promoting the revolution—in no case to endeavour to outrun the people's development, but to wait until a movement forward occurred as a result of their own experience and their own struggle. In October we confined ourselves to sweeping away at one blow the age-old enemy of the peasants, the feudal landowner, the big landed proprietor. This was a struggle in which all the peasants joined. At this stage the peasants were not yet divided into proletarians, semi-proletarians, poor peasants and bourgeoisie. We socialists knew there would be no socialism without such a struggle, but we also realised that knowing it was not enough—it had to be brought home to the millions, and through their own experience, not through propaganda. And for that reason, since the peasants as a whole could only conceive of the revolution on the basis of equal land tenure, we openly declared in our decree of October 26, 1917, that we would take the Peasant Mandate on the Land as our starting-point.*

We said frankly that it did not accord with our views, that it was not communism, but we were not imposing on the peasants something that was merely in accord with our programme and not with their views. We said we were marching alongside them, as with fellow-workers, fully confident

* See present edition, Vol. 26, pp. 258-60.—*Ed.*

that the development of the revolution would lead them to the conclusions we ourselves had drawn. The result of this policy is the peasant movement. The agrarian reform began with the socialisation of the land which we voted for and carried out, though openly declaring that it did not accord with our views. We knew that the idea of equal land tenure had the support of the vast majority, and we had no desire to force anything upon them. We were prepared to wait until the peasants themselves abandoned the idea and advanced further. So we waited and we have been able to prepare our forces.

The law we then passed was based on general democratic principles, on that which unites the rich kulak peasant with the poor peasant—hatred for the landowner. It was based on the general idea of equality which was undoubtedly a revolutionary idea directed against the old monarchist system. From this law we had to pass to differentiation of the peasants. The land socialisation law was universally accepted; it was unanimously adopted both by us and by those who did not subscribe to Bolshevik policy. We gave the agricultural communes the biggest say in deciding who should own the land. We left the road open for agriculture to develop along socialist lines, knowing perfectly well that at that time, October 1917, it was not yet ready for it. Our preparatory work cleared the way for the gigantic and epoch-making step we have now taken, one that has not been taken by any other country, not even by the most democratic republic. That step was taken this summer by all the peasants, even in the most remote villages of Russia. When food difficulties arose and famine threatened, when the heritage of the past and the aftermath of the accursed four years of war made themselves felt, when counter-revolution and the Civil War had deprived us of our richest grain region, when all this reached a climax and the cities were menaced by famine, the only, the most reliable and firm bulwark of our government, the advanced workers of the towns and industrial regions, went en masse to the countryside. It is slander to say the workers went there to provoke an armed conflict between workers and peasants. Events expose that slander. The workers went to put down the rural exploiters, the kulaks, who were making huge fortunes out of grain

profiteering at a time when people were starving. They went to help the poor peasants, that is, the majority of the rural population. The July crisis, when kulak revolts swept the whole of Russia, clearly showed that their mission had not been in vain, that they had extended the hand of alliance, and that their preparatory work had merged with the efforts of the peasants. The working and exploited country people settled the July crisis by rising up everywhere and coming out in alliance with the urban proletariat. Today Comrade Zinoviev told me over the telephone that 18,000 people are attending the regional congress of Poor Peasants' Committees in Petrograd and that there is remarkable enthusiasm and high spirits.⁵⁰

As events unfolding throughout Russia became more evident, the village poor realised from their own experience when they went into action what the struggle against the kulaks meant, and that to keep the cities supplied with food and to re-establish commodity exchange, without which the countryside cannot live, they must part company with the rural bourgeoisie and the kulaks. They have to organise separately. And we have now taken the first and most momentous step of the socialist revolution in the countryside. We could not have taken that step in October. We gauged the moment when we could approach the people. And we have now reached a point where the socialist revolution in the rural areas has begun, where in every village, even the most remote, the peasant knows that his rich neighbour, the kulak, if he is engaged in grain profiteering, sees everything in the light of his old, backwoods mentality.

And so the countryside, the rural poor, uniting with their leaders, the city workers, are only now providing us with a firm and stable foundation for real socialist construction. Socialist construction will only now begin in the countryside. Only now are Soviets and farms being formed which are systematically working towards large-scale socialised farming, towards making full use of knowledge, science and technology, realising that even simple, elementary human culture cannot be based on the old, reactionary, ignorant way of life. The work here is even more difficult than in industry, and even more mistakes are being made by our local committees and Soviets. But they learn from

their mistakes. We are not afraid of mistakes when they are made by ordinary people who take a conscientious attitude to socialist construction, because we rely only on the experience and effort of our own people.

And now the tremendous upheaval that in so short a time has led us to socialism in the countryside shows that this fight has been crowned with success. The Red Army is the most striking proof of that. You know the state we were in during the imperialist world war when conditions in Russia made life unbearable for the common people. We know that at that time we were in an utterly helpless state. We frankly told the working people the whole truth. We exposed the secret imperialist treaties, the fruits of a policy which serves as a massive instrument of deception, and which in America today, the most advanced of the bourgeois imperialist democratic republics, is more than ever deceiving the people and leading them by the nose. When the imperialist character of the war became patent to all, the Russian Soviet Republic was the only country that completely shattered the bourgeoisie's secret foreign policy. We exposed the secret treaties and declared, through Comrade Trotsky, to all countries of the world: We appeal to you to put an end to this war in a democratic way, without annexations and indemnities, and frankly and proudly declare the truth, a bitter truth but the truth nevertheless, that only a revolution against the bourgeois governments can put an end to this war. But we stood alone. So we had to pay the price of that terribly excruciating peace which was forced upon us by the Brest-Litovsk Treaty and which drove many of our sympathisers to gloom and despair. That was because we were alone. But we did our duty and showed up the aims of the war for everyone to see! The onslaught of German imperialism was able to overwhelm us because it took some time before our workers and peasants could organise properly. We had no army then; all we had was the old, disorganised, imperialist army which had been driven to fight in the war for aims which the soldiers did not support and with which they did not sympathise. So we had to go through a very painful period. It was a time when the people needed a respite from the terrible imperialist war, and had to realise that a new war was beginning. We are entitled to regard the war we shall

wage in defence of our socialist revolution as our war. That is what millions and tens of millions of people had to learn to appreciate from their own experience. It took months. It took a long and hard battle for this realisation to get through. By this summer, however, everyone saw that it had got through at last, and that the breakthrough had come. Everyone realised that to have the army fight for the Soviet Republic, the army that comes from the people, that is sacrificing itself, and that after four years of bloody slaughter is again prepared to go to war, our country had to replace the weariness and despair of the people going to war by a clear realisation that they go to their death for their own cause: for the workers' and peasants' Soviets and the socialist republic. That has been achieved.

The victories we gained over the Czechs in the summer, and the news of big victories now coming in go to show that a turning-point has come, and that the hardest task—organising the people in a politically-conscious, socialist way after four years of terrible war—has been achieved. That political consciousness has penetrated a long way among the people. Tens of millions of people have come to realise they are tackling a difficult job. And that gives us assurance that we shall not despair, even though the forces of world imperialism, stronger than us today, are being mustered against us, even though we are surrounded by the soldiers of the imperialists, who realise the menace from the Soviet government and are eager to strangle it, and even though we truthfully say they are stronger than us.

We say we are growing, the Soviet Republic is growing. The cause of the proletarian revolution is growing faster than the imperialist forces are closing in upon us. We are full of hope and assurance that we are fighting in the interests of the world socialist revolution as well as the Russian socialist revolution. Our hopes of victory are growing faster because our workers are becoming more politically-conscious. What was the state of Soviet organisation last October? Only the first steps were being taken. We could not make it perfect or put it on a proper basis. But now we have the Soviet Constitution. The Soviet Constitution, ratified in July, is, as we know, not the invention of a commission, nor the creation of lawyers, nor is it copied from other

constitutions. The world has never known such a constitution as ours. It embodies the workers' experience of struggle and organisation against the exploiters both at home and abroad. We possess a fund of fighting experience. (*Applause.*) And this fund of experience has provided a striking corroboration of the fact that the organised workers created a Soviet government without civil servants, without a standing army and without privileges (privileges in practice for the bourgeoisie), and that they created the foundations of a new system in the factories. We are getting down to work and drawing in new helpers, who are essential if the Soviet Constitution is to be carried into effect. We now have ready new recruits, young peasants, who must be drawn into the work and help us carry the job through.

The last question I want to touch upon is the international situation. We are standing shoulder to shoulder with our international comrades, and we have now seen for ourselves the resoluteness and enthusiasm they put into their conviction that the Russian proletarian revolution will go along with them as the world revolution.

As the revolution's international significance grew, the imperialists of the whole world banded even closer and more furiously together against us. In October 1917 they regarded our Republic as a curiosity not worth serious attention. In February they regarded it as an experiment in socialism not to be taken seriously. But the Republic's army grew and gained in strength until the very difficult task of creating a socialist Red Army had been accomplished. As our cause gained in strength and its successes multiplied, the opposition and the hatred of the imperialists of all countries grew more rabid. Things have reached a state where British and French capitalists, who had proclaimed they were Wilhelm's enemies, are now on the verge of joining forces with this same Wilhelm in an effort to strangle the Socialist Soviet Republic. For they have come to realise that it is no longer a curiosity or an experiment in socialism, but the hotbed, the really genuine hotbed, of the world socialist revolution. Hence, the number of our enemies has increased along with the successes of our revolution. We must realise what is lying in store for us, without in any way concealing the gravity of the situation. We shall go to meet it not alone

but with the workers of Vienna and Berlin, who are moving into the same fight, and who will perhaps bring greater discipline and class-consciousness to our common cause.

To give you an idea of how the clouds are gathering over our Soviet Republic and what dangers are threatening us, I shall read you the full text of a Note sent to us by the German Government through its consulate:

"G. V. Chicherin, People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs, Moscow, November 5, 1918.

On the instructions of the German Imperial Government, the Imperial German Consulate has the honour to notify the Russian Federative Soviet Republic of the following: The German Government has already had occasion to protest twice against the impermissible campaign that is being conducted against German state institutions through declarations made by official Russian authorities in contravention of Article 2 of the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk. It can no longer confine itself to protests against this campaign, which is not only a violation of the said stipulations of the Treaty, but a serious departure from normal international practice.

When the Soviet Government established its Diplomatic Legation in Berlin after the conclusion of the Peace Treaty, Herr Joffe, the appointed Russian representative, received a clear reminder of the need to refrain from any agitation or propaganda in Germany. To this he replied that he was acquainted with Article 2 of the Brest-Litovsk Treaty and was aware that in his capacity as representative of a foreign Power he must not interfere in Germany's internal affairs. Herr Joffe and the departments in his charge accordingly enjoyed in Berlin the attention and confidence normally accorded to extraterritorial foreign legations. This confidence was, however, betrayed. It has been clear for some time that the Russian Legation has been in close contact with certain people working for the overthrow of the political order in Germany, and, by employing such people in its service, has been interested in a movement aimed at overthrowing the existing system in Germany.

The following incident, which occurred on the 4th instant, revealed that the Russian Legation, by importing leaflets calling for revolution, is even taking an active part in movements aimed at overthrowing the existing order, thereby abusing the privilege of employing diplomatic couriers. Because one of the boxes in the official baggage of the Russian courier who arrived in Berlin yesterday was damaged during transportation, it was ascertained that the boxes contained revolutionary leaflets printed in German and, judging by their contents, designed for dissemination in Germany.

The German Government has further grounds for complaint because of the attitude taken by the Soviet Government towards the expiation to be made for the assassination of Count Mirbach, the Imperial Ambassador. The Russian Government solemnly declared that it would do everything in its power to bring the criminals to court. But the German

Government has not observed any signs of the prosecution and punishment of the criminals having been undertaken, or even of any intention of it being done. The murderers escaped from a house surrounded on all sides by Public Security men of the Russian Government. The instigators of the assassination, who have publicly admitted they were behind the whole affair, to this day go unpunished and, according to information received, have even been pardoned.

The German Government protests against such violations of the Treaty and of public law. It is obliged to demand guarantees from the Russian Government that no further agitation and propaganda running counter to the Peace Treaty will be conducted. It must furthermore insist on the expiation of the assassination of the Ambassador, Count Mirbach, by the punishment of the perpetrators and instigators of the murder. Until such time as these demands are satisfied, the German Government must request the Government of the Soviet Republic to withdraw its diplomatic and other representatives from Germany. The Russian plenipotentiary in Berlin was today informed that a special train for the departure of the diplomatic and consular representatives in Berlin and of other Russian officials in the city will be ready tomorrow evening, and that measures will be taken to secure the unhampered transit of all Russian personnel to the Russian frontier. The Soviet Government is requested to enable the German representatives in Moscow and Petrograd to leave at the same time, with the observance of all the demands of courtesy. Other Russian representatives in Germany, and likewise German officials in other parts of Russia, will be informed they must leave within a week, the former for Russia, the latter for Germany. The German Government concludes in anticipation that all the rules of courtesy will be similarly observed towards the latter German officials in relation to their departure and that other German subjects or persons under German protection will be allowed the opportunity of unhampered departure should they request it."

We all know perfectly well, comrades, that the German Government has been fully aware that German socialists enjoyed the hospitality of the Russian Embassy and that no supporters of German imperialism ever crossed the threshold of the Russian Embassy. Its friends were those socialists who opposed the war and who sympathised with Karl Liebknecht. They have been guests of the Embassy ever since it opened, and we have had dealings with them alone. The German Government was perfectly aware of that. It followed the movements of every representative of our government as zealously as the government of Nicholas II used to follow the movements of our comrades. The German Government is now making this move not because the situation has in any way changed, but because it formerly felt stronger, and was not afraid that one "burning" house on the streets of Berlin

would set all Germany alight. The German Government has lost its head, and now that the whole of Germany is ablaze, it thinks it can put out the fire by turning its police hose on a single house. (*Stormy applause.*)

That is simply ridiculous. If the German Government is going to break off diplomatic relations, all we can say is that we knew it would, and that it is doing all it can to get an alliance with the British and French imperialists. We know Wilson's government has received telegram after telegram requesting that German troops be left in Poland, the Ukraine, Estonia and Latvia. Although they are enemies of German imperialism, the German troops are doing their job: they are putting down the Bolsheviks.* They can clear out when pro-Entente "armies of liberation" appear on the scene to strangle the Bolsheviks.

We are perfectly aware of what is going on and none of it is unexpected. We merely repeat that now that Germany is on fire and Austria is all ablaze, now that they have had to liberate Liebknecht and allow him to visit the Russian Embassy, where a joint meeting of Russian and German socialists with Liebknecht at their head was held, such a step on the part of the German Government shows not so much that they want to fight as that they have completely lost their heads. It shows they are at a loss for a decision because Anglo-American imperialism, the most brutal enemy of all, is advancing upon them, an enemy that has crushed Austria with peace terms a hundred times more onerous than those of the Brest-Litovsk Peace Treaty. Germany sees that these liberators want to strangle, crush and torture her too. But at the same time the workingman's Germany is rebelling. The German army proved to be useless and unfit for action not because discipline was weak but because the soldiers who refused to fight were transferred from the Eastern front to the German Western front and carried with them what the bourgeoisie call world Bolshevism.

That is why the German army was unfit for action and why this document is the best proof of Germany's utter confusion. We say it will lead to a diplomatic rupture, and perhaps even to war if they can find the strength to lead the white-guard troops. We have therefore sent a telegram to all the

* See pp. 128-30 of this volume. — *Ed.*

Soviets of Deputies,⁶⁰ which concludes by warning them to be on their guard, to hold themselves in readiness and muster all their forces, for this is just another sign that the chief aim of international imperialism is the overthrow of Bolshevism. That does not mean defeating Russia alone. It means defeating their own workers in every country. But they will not succeed, no matter what brutalities and outrages may follow this decision. These vultures are preparing to swoop down on Russia from the South, through the Dardanelles, or by way of Bulgaria and Rumania. They are negotiating for the formation of a White Army in Germany to be pitted against Russia. We are fully aware of this danger, and say quite plainly that we have not worked a year for nothing; we have laid the foundations, we are coming up to decisive battles, battles which will indeed be decisive. But we are not alone: the proletariat of Western Europe has gone into action and has not left anything standing in Austria-Hungary. The government of the country is just about as helpless, as wildly confused, has lost its head as completely as Nicholas Romanov's government at the end of February 1917. Our slogan must be: Put every effort into the fight once more, and remember that we are coming up to the last, decisive fight, not for the Russian revolution alone, but for the world socialist revolution!

We know that the imperialist vultures are still stronger than us. They can still inflict wholesale damage, brutalities and atrocities upon our country. But they cannot defeat the world revolution. They are full of savage hatred, so we tell ourselves that come what may, every Russian worker and peasant will do his duty and will face death if the interests of defence of the revolution demand it. No matter what miseries the imperialists may still inflict upon us, it will not save them. Imperialism will perish and the world socialist revolution will triumph in face of all odds! (*Stormy applause passing into prolonged ovation.*)

Newspaper reports published
November 9, 1918 in *Pravda*
No. 242 and *Izvestia* No. 244

Published according to
the book checked with
the verbatim report
and the *Pravda* text

2

SPEECH ON THE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION
NOVEMBER 8

(Prolonged applause.) Comrades, from the very beginning of the October Revolution, foreign policy and international relations have been the main questions facing us. Not merely because from now on all the states in the world are being firmly linked by imperialism into a single system, or rather, into one dirty, bloody mass, but because the complete victory of the socialist revolution in one country alone is inconceivable and demands the most active co-operation of at least several advanced countries, which do not include Russia. Hence one of the main problems of the revolution is now the extent to which we succeed in broadening the revolution in other countries too, and the extent to which we succeed meanwhile in warding off imperialism.

I should like to remind you briefly of the main stages of our international policy over the past year. As I have already had occasion to point out in my speech on the anniversary of the revolution, the main feature characterising our position a year ago was that we were on our own.* No matter how sound our conviction that a revolutionary force was being and had been created throughout Europe and that the war would not end without revolution, there were no signs at the time that a revolution had begun or was beginning. In these circumstances we could do nothing but direct our foreign policy efforts to enlightening the working people of Western Europe. This was not because

* See pp. 138-39 of this volume.—*Ed.*

we claimed to be more enlightened than they, but because so long as the bourgeoisie of a country have not been overthrown, military censorship and that fantastically bloodthirsty atmosphere which accompanies every war, particularly a reactionary one, predominate in that country. You well appreciate that in the most democratic, republican countries, war means military censorship and unprecedented methods employed by the bourgeoisie and the bourgeois military staffs to deceive the people. We set out to share our achievements in this respect with other nations. We did everything possible for this when we annulled and published the disgraceful secret treaties which the ex-tsar had concluded with the British and French capitalists to the benefit of the Russian capitalists. You know that these were downright predatory treaties. You know that the government of Kerensky and the Mensheviks kept these treaties secret and upheld them. By way of exception, we come across statements in that section of the British and French press which is to any degree honest that, thanks only to the Russian revolution, the French and the British learned much that was material to them as regards their diplomatic history.

We have certainly done very little from the point of view of the social revolution as a whole, but what we have done has been one of the greatest steps in its preparation.

If we now make a general survey of the results gained by the exposure of German imperialism, we shall see that it is now obvious to the working people of all countries that they were made to wage a bloody and predatory war. And at the end of this year of war the behaviour of Britain and America is beginning to be exposed in the same way, since the people are opening their eyes and begin to see through the evil designs. That is all we have done, but we have done our bit. The exposure of these treaties was a blow to imperialism. The terms of the peace treaty which we were compelled to conclude proved to be a powerful weapon of propaganda and agitation; we did more with them than any other government or nation has done. But while it is true that the attempt we made to awaken the people did not produce immediate results, we never even assumed that the

revolution would begin immediately, or that all would be lost. During the past fifteen years we have brought about two revolutions, and we have clearly seen how much time must elapse before they grip the people. Recent events in Austria and Germany confirm this. We said that we had no intention of allying ourselves with robbers and becoming robbers ourselves; no, we expected to arouse the proletariat of the enemy countries. We were jeered at and told we were preparing to arouse the German proletariat which would strangle us while we were preparing to launch a propaganda attack. But facts have shown we were right to assume that the working people in all countries are equally hostile to imperialism. They only need to be given a certain period for preparation; the Russian people, too, despite memories of the 1905 Revolution, took some time before they again came up for revolution.

Before the Brest-Litovsk Peace we did everything in our power to hit at imperialism. If the history of the growth of the proletarian revolution did not completely wipe this out, and if the Brest-Litovsk Peace forced us to retreat before imperialism, this was because we were insufficiently prepared in January 1918. Fate condemned us to isolation, and we went through an agonising period after the Brest-Litovsk Peace.

Comrades, the four years which we spent in world war ended in peace, but on onerous terms. In the final analysis, however, even these onerous peace terms proved that we were right and that our hopes were not built on sand. With every passing month we grew strong while West-European imperialism grew weak. Now, as a result, we see that Germany, who six months ago completely ignored our Embassy and thought there could be no Red institution there, recently, at any rate, has been weakening. The latest telegram informs us of the German imperialists' appeal to the people to keep calm, saying that peace is near at hand. We know what is meant when monarchs appeal for calm and promise to do the impossible in the near future. If Germany gets peace soon, it will be a Brest-Litovsk Peace, which instead of peace will bring the working people more misery than ever.

The results of our international policy shaped in such a way that six months after the Brest-Litovsk Peace we were

a devastated country to the bourgeoisie, but, to the proletariat, we were rapidly developing and now head the proletarian army which has begun to shake Austria and Germany. This success vindicated and fully justified all our sacrifices in any worker's eyes. If we were to be suddenly wiped out, if our activities were to be cut short—this is impossible since miracles do not happen—yet if this were to happen we would be justified in saying, without concealing our mistakes, that we had made full use of the period, offered us by fate, for the world socialist revolution. We have done everything possible for the working people of Russia, and we have done more than anyone else for the world proletarian revolution. (Applause.)

In recent months, and in recent weeks, the international situation has begun to change sharply; now German imperialism is almost completely defeated. All designs on the Ukraine which the German imperialists fostered among their working people proved to be empty promises. It turned out that American imperialism was ready, and a blow was struck at Germany. A totally different situation has arisen. We have been under no illusions. After the October Revolution we were considerably weaker than imperialism and even now we are weaker than international imperialism. We must repeat this now so as not to deceive ourselves: following the October Revolution we were weaker and could not fight. Now we are weaker too and must do everything we can to avoid a clash with imperialism.

That we were able to survive a year after the October Revolution was due to the split of international imperialism into two predatory groups: Anglo-French-American on the one hand, and German on the other, which were locked in mortal combat, and which had no time for us. Neither group could muster large forces against us, which they would have done had they been in a position to do so. They were blinded by the bloodthirsty atmosphere of war. The material sacrifices required to carry on the war demanded the utmost concentration of their efforts. They had no time for us, not because by some miracle we were stronger than the imperialists—no, that would be nonsense—but only because international imperialism had split into two predatory groups which were at each other's throats. Only thanks

to this the Soviet Republic was able to openly declare war on the imperialists of all countries, depriving them of their capital in the shape of foreign loans, slapping them in the face and openly emptying their plunder-laden pockets.

An end has come to the period of declarations which we then made over the correspondence started by the German imperialists, even though world imperialism could not tear into us as it should have done in line with its hostility and thirst for capitalist profits, which had been fantastically expanded by the war. Until the moment of the Anglo-American imperialists' victory over the other group they were fully occupied fighting among themselves, and so had no chance to launch a decisive campaign against the Soviet Republic. There is no longer a second group. Only one group of victors remains. This has completely altered our international position, and we must take this change into account. The facts show how this change bears on the development of the international situation. The workers' revolution is now winning in the defeated countries; everyone can clearly see what tremendous advances it has made. When we took power in October we were nothing more in Europe than a single spark. True, the sparks began to fly, and they flew from us. This is our greatest achievement, but even so, these were isolated sparks. Now most countries within the sphere of German-Austrian imperialism are aflame (Bulgaria, Austria and Hungary). We know that from Bulgaria the revolution has spread to Serbia. We know how these worker-peasant revolutions passed through Austria and reached Germany. Several countries are enveloped in the flames of workers' revolution. In this respect our efforts and sacrifices have been justified. They were not reckless adventures, as our enemies slanderously claimed, but an essential step towards world revolution, which had to be taken by the country that had been placed in the lead, despite its underdevelopment and backwardness.

This is one result, and the most important from the point of view of the final outcome of the imperialist war. The other result is the one to which I referred earlier, that Anglo-American imperialism is now exposing itself in the same way as Austro-German did in its time. We can see that

if, at the time of the Brest-Litovsk negotiations, Germany had been somewhat level-headed, able to keep herself in check and to refrain from making gambles, she would have been able to maintain her domination and undoubtedly could have secured an advantageous position in the West. She did not do this because when a machine like a war involving millions and tens of millions, a war which inflamed chauvinist passions to the utmost, a war bound up with capitalist interests totalling hundreds of billions of rubles—when such a machine has gathered full speed there are no brakes that can stop it. This machine went farther than the German imperialists themselves desired, and they were crushed by it. They were stuck; they ended up like a man who had gorged himself to death. And now, before our very eyes, British and American imperialism is in this extremely ugly, but, from the viewpoint of the revolutionary proletariat, extremely useful position. You might have thought they would have had much greater political experience than Germany. Here are people used to democratic rule, not to the rule of some Junker or other, people who went through the hardest period of their history hundreds of years ago. You might have thought these people would have retained their presence of mind. If we were to speak as individuals, from the point of view of democracy in general, as bourgeois philistines, professors, who have understood nothing from the struggle between imperialism and the working class, whether or not they were capable of level-headedness, if we reasoned from the point of view of democracy in general, then we would have to say that Britain and America are countries with a centuries-old tradition of democracy, that the bourgeoisie there would be able to hold their ground. If by some means they were to succeed now in holding on, this would at any rate be for a fairly long period. But it seems that the same thing is happening to them as happened to the militarist-despotic Germany. In this imperialist war there is a tremendous difference between Russia and the republican countries. The imperialist war is so steeped in blood, so predatory and bestial, that it has effaced even these important differences, and in this respect it has brought the freest democracy of America to the level of semi-militarist, despotic Germany.

We see that Britain and America, countries which had greater opportunities than others for remaining democratic republics, have overdone things as savagely and insanely as Germany did in her time, and so they are heading, just as quickly, and perhaps even faster, towards the end so successfully arrived at by German imperialism. It swelled out fantastically over three-quarters of Europe, became distended and then burst, leaving behind it an awful stench. Now British and American imperialism is racing to the same end. You only have to take a cursory glance at the armistice and peace terms which the British and Americans, the "liberators" of the people from German imperialism, are presenting to the defeated nations. Take Bulgaria. You would have thought that a country like Bulgaria could hold no terror for the Anglo-American imperialist colossus. Nevertheless, the revolution in this small, weak, absolutely helpless country caused the Anglo-Americans to lose their heads and present armistice terms that are tantamount to occupation. In this country where a peasants' republic has been proclaimed, in Sofia, an important railway junction, the whole railway is now in the hands of Anglo-American troops. They are forced to fight this little peasants' republic. From the military point of view this is a walkover. People who take the view of the bourgeoisie, of the old ruling class, of old military relations, merely smile contemptuously. What does this pygmy Bulgaria signify in comparison with the Anglo-American forces? Nothing from the military standpoint, but a great deal from the revolutionary standpoint. This is not a colony where they are used to exterminating the defeated people in their millions. The British and Americans consider this is only establishing law and order, bringing civilisation and Christianity to African savages. But this is not Central Africa. Here the soldiers, no matter how strong their army, become demoralised when they come up against a revolution. Germany is proof enough of this. In Germany, at any rate as regards discipline, the soldiers were model army men. Yet when the Germans marched into the Ukraine, factors other than discipline came into play. The starving German soldier marched for bread, and it would have been unrealistic to demand that he should not steal too much bread. Moreover, we know that

in this country he was most of all infected by the spirit of the Russian revolution. The German bourgeoisie were well aware of this and it caused Wilhelm to panic. The Hohenzollerns are mistaken if they imagine that Germany will shed a single drop of blood for them. This is the result of the policy of bellicose German imperialism. The same thing is repeating itself in regard to Britain. The Anglo-American army is already becoming demoralised; this began as soon as it launched the ferocious campaign against Bulgaria. And this is only the beginning. Austria followed Bulgaria. Permit me to read you some of the clauses of the terms dictated by the Anglo-American imperialist victors. These are the people who most of all shouted to the working people that they were conducting a war of liberation, that their chief aim was to crush Prussian militarism which threatened to spread the despotic regime over all countries. They shouted loudest that they were conducting a war of liberation. This was a deception. You know that bourgeois lawyers, these parliamentarians who have spent their whole lives learning the art of deception without blushing, find it easy to deceive each other—but they don't get away with it when they have to deceive the workers in the same way. British and American politicians and parliamentarians are past masters at this art. But they will not get away with deception. The working people, whom they incited in the name of freedom, will come to their senses straight away, and even more so when, on a mass scale, not from proclamations (which help, but do not really move the revolution), but from their own experience, they see they are being deceived, when they become aware of the peace terms with Austria.

These are peace terms now being forced on a comparatively weak, disintegrating state by people who shouted that the Bolsheviks were traitors because they signed the Brest-Litovsk Peace Treaty. When the Germans wanted to send their soldiers to Moscow, we said we would rather all die in battle than agree to this. (*Applause.*) We told ourselves great sacrifices would have to be made in the occupied areas, but everybody knows how Soviet Russia helped and kept them supplied with necessities. Now the democratic troops of Britain and France will have to serve to "maintain law and order", and this when there are Soviets of Workers' Deputies

in Bulgaria and Serbia, when there are Soviets of Workers' Deputies in Vienna and Budapest. We know what kind of order this means. It means that the Anglo-American troops are to be the throttlers and executioners of the world revolution.

Comrades, when the Russian serf troops were sent to suppress the Hungarian Revolution in 1848,⁶¹ they were able to get away with it because they were serfs; they were able to get away with it in relation to Poland.⁶² But people who have known freedom for a century and who were incited to hate German imperialism because it was a beast which had to be destroyed, must understand that Anglo-American imperialism is the same sort of beast whom it would be only right to destroy as well!

And now history, with its usual malicious irony, has arrived at the point where, after the exposure of German imperialism, it is the turn of Anglo-French imperialism to utterly expose itself. We declare to the Russian, German and Austrian working people that these are not the Russian serf troops of 1848! They will not get away with it! They are out to stop people getting from capitalism to freedom and to suppress the revolution. We are absolutely convinced that this bloated monster will fall into the same abyss as did the German imperialist monster.

I now turn to matters which affect us most of all. I shall begin with the peace terms which Germany will have to agree to. The comrades from the Commissariat for Foreign Affairs told me that *The Times*, the chief mouthpiece of the fabulously rich British bourgeoisie who actually shape the entire policy, has already published the terms to be imposed on Germany. She is expected to hand over Heligoland and the Wilhelmshaven Canal, Essen, where practically all military equipment is manufactured, disband her merchant fleet, immediately hand over Alsace-Lorraine and pay indemnities totalling 60 thousand million, a great part of which must be paid in kind because money has depreciated everywhere and British merchants too have begun to calculate in another currency. We can see that the peace terms they are preparing for Germany will be completely devastating, far harsher than the Brest-Litovsk terms. They are strong enough materially and physically to do so if it were not

for the existence of that awful Bolshevism. By imposing these peace terms they are preparing their own doom. For this is happening in civilised countries in the twentieth century, not in Central Africa. The once disciplined German soldier who put down the illiterate Ukrainian people has now buried his discipline. So it is all the more certain that the British and American imperialists will bury themselves when they make the gamble, which will bring about their political downfall, of making their troops throttlers and gendarmes of all Europe. They have been trying to destroy Russia for some time, and have been thinking of attacking her for some time. You only have to recall the Murmansk occupation, the millions they squandered on the Czechs, the treaty they concluded with Japan. And now Britain has a treaty with the Turks which gives her Baku so that she may strangle us by depriving us of raw materials.

British troops are ready to attack Russia from the South, through the Dardanelles or through Bulgaria and Rumania. They are closing in around the Soviet Republic, they are trying to cut off our economic contacts with the whole world. For this reason they compelled Holland to break off diplomatic relations with us.⁶³ When Germany expelled our Ambassador she acted, if not in direct agreement with Anglo-French policy, then hoping to do them a service so that they should be magnanimous to her. The implication was that we are also fulfilling the duties of executioner against the Bolsheviks, your enemies.

The main point about the international situation is (as I mentioned the other day) that we have never been so near to world proletarian revolution as we are now. We have proved we were not mistaken in banking on world proletarian revolution. Our great national and economic sacrifices were not made in vain. We achieved successes. Yet if we have never previously been so close to world revolution, then it is also true to say that we have never been in such a dangerous situation as we are now. The imperialists were busy among themselves, but now one group has been wiped out by the Anglo-French-American group, which considers its main task to be the extermination of world Bolshevism and the strangulation of its main centre,

the Russian Soviet Republic. To do this, they intend to surround themselves with a Great Wall of China so as to keep out the plague, the plague of Bolshevism. These people are trying to rid themselves of Bolshevism by going into quarantine, but this cannot be done. Even if these Anglo-French imperialist gentlemen, who possess the best techniques in the world, succeed in building this Great Wall around the Republic, the germ of Bolshevism will still penetrate the wall and infect the workers of the world. (*Applause.*)

The West-European press, the press of Anglo-French imperialism, tries its hardest to keep silent about the state of imperialism. No lie or slander is vile enough to use against the Soviet government. It is true to say now that all the Anglo-French and American papers, with financial backing running into billions, are in capitalist hands and that they act in one syndicate to suppress the truth about Soviet Russia, to spread lies and slander about us. Yet despite the fact that for years there has been a military censorship which has prevented a word of truth about the Soviet Republic from appearing in the newspapers of the democratic countries, not a single large workers' meeting held anywhere goes by without the workers siding with the Bolsheviks, because it is impossible to hide the truth. The enemy accuses us of implementing the dictatorship of the proletariat. They are right and we do not hide it. The fact that the Soviet Government is not afraid and openly admits this attracts more millions of workers to its side, because the dictatorship is directed against the exploiters, and the working people see and are convinced that the struggle we are waging against the exploiters is a serious one and will be brought to a serious conclusion. Although the European papers surround us with a conspiracy of silence, they have so far announced that they regard it their duty to attack Russia because Russia surrendered to Germany, because Russia is in fact a German agent, because government leaders in Russia, they claim, are German agents. New forged documents, for which a good price is paid, appear every month proving that Lenin and Trotsky are downright traitors and German agents. Despite all this they cannot hide the truth, and from time to time there are open signs that the imperialist gentlemen feel uneasy. *L'Echo de Paris*⁶⁴ admits: "We are going into

Russia to break the power of the Bolsheviks." Their official line is that they are only fighting German domination, not conducting a war with Russia and not interfering in military matters. Our French internationalists who publish the *III-me Internationale*⁶⁵ in Moscow cited this quotation, and although we have been cut off from Paris and France by an extremely elaborate Great Wall of China, we tell the French imperialist gentlemen that they cannot defend themselves from their own bourgeoisie. Indeed, hundreds of thousands of French workers know this small quotation, and others too, and see that all the declarations of their rulers, of their bourgeoisie, are nothing but lies. Their own bourgeoisie let the cat out of the bag; they acknowledge that they want to break the power of the Bolsheviks. After four years of bloody war they have to tell their people: go and fight again against Russia to break the power of the Bolsheviks whom we hate because they owe us 17 thousand million and won't pay up,⁶⁶ because they are rude to capitalists, landowners and tsars. Civilised nations who come down to admitting such things, patently betray the failure of their policy. No matter how strong they may be militarily we calmly review their strength and say: but you have in your rear an even more terrible enemy—the common people, whom you have deceived up to now; so much so that your tongue has dried up from the lies and slander you have spread about Soviet Russia. Similar information may be gleaned from *The Manchester Guardian*⁶⁷ of October 23. This British bourgeois newspaper writes: "If the Allied armies still remain in Russia and still operate in Russia, their purpose can only be to effect a revolution in ... Russia. The Allied governments must, therefore, either ... put an end to their operations in Russia or announce that they are at war with Bolshevism."

I repeat that the significance of this small quotation, which sounds to us like a revolutionary call, like a powerful revolutionary appeal, is that it is written by a bourgeois newspaper, which is itself an enemy of the socialists, but feels that the truth can no longer be hidden. If bourgeois papers write in this vein you can imagine what the British workers must be thinking and saying. You know the sort of language used by the liberals in tsarist times, prior to the 1905 and 1917 revolutions. You know this language

heralded an impending explosion amidst the revolutionary proletariat. From the language of these British bourgeois liberals, therefore, you can draw conclusions about what is going on in the moods, minds and hearts of the British, French and American workers. We must, therefore, face the bitter truth about our international position. The world revolution is not far off, but it cannot develop according to a special time-table. Having survived two revolutions we well appreciate this. We know, however, that although the imperialists cannot contain the world revolution, certain countries are likely to be defeated, and even heavier losses are possible. They know that Russia is in the birth-pangs of a proletarian revolution, but they are mistaken if they think that by crushing one centre of the revolution they will crush the revolution in other countries.

We, for our part, must admit that the situation is more dangerous than ever before, that once again we shall have to summon up every effort. Over the past year we have laid a firm foundation, created a socialist Red Army with a new discipline, and we are absolutely certain that we can and must continue the work we are doing. At all meetings, in every Soviet institution, at trade union meetings and at meetings of Poor Peasants' Committees we must say: Comrades, we have survived a year and have achieved some success, but all this is still insufficient when we consider the powerful enemy bearing down on us. This enemy, Anglo-French imperialism, is world-wide, powerful and has defeated the whole world. We are going to fight it not because we think ourselves economically and technically on a par with the advanced countries of Europe. No, but we do know this enemy is going to topple into the abyss into which Austro-German imperialism once toppled; we know that the enemy, which has now ensnared Turkey, seized Bulgaria and is bent on occupying the whole of Austria-Hungary with the object of establishing a tsarist, gendarme regime, is heading for its doom. We know this as a historical fact, and that is why, while in no way attempting the impossible, we say we can beat off Anglo-French imperialism!

Every step in strengthening our Red Army will be echoed by a dozen steps in the disintegration of and revolutions in this apparently all-powerful enemy. There is therefore

no cause whatsoever for despair or pessimism. We know the danger is great. It may be that fate has even heavier sacrifices in store for us. Even if they can crush one country, they can never crush the world proletarian revolution, they will only add more fuel to the flames that will consume them all. (*Prolonged applause passing into ovation.*)

¹ Newspaper reports published in *Izvestia* No. 244, November 9, 1918, and in *Pravda* No. 243, November 10, 1918

**SPEECH AT THE UNVEILING
OF A MEMORIAL TO MARX AND ENGELS
NOVEMBER 7, 1918**

We are unveiling a memorial to Marx and Engels, the leaders of the world workers' revolution.

Humanity has for ages suffered and languished under the oppression of a tiny handful of exploiters who maltreated millions of labourers. But whereas the exploiters of an earlier period, the landowners, robbed and maltreated the peasant serfs, who were disunited, scattered and ignorant, the exploiters of the new period, the capitalists, came face to face with the vanguard of the downtrodden people, the urban, factory, industrial workers. They were united by the factory, they were enlightened by urban life, they were steeled by the common strike struggle and by revolutionary action.

It is to the great historic merit of Marx and Engels that they proved by scientific analysis the inevitability of capitalism's collapse and its transition to communism, under which there will be no more exploitation of man by man.

It is to the great historic merit of Marx and Engels that they indicated to the workers of the world their role, their task, their mission, namely, to be the first to rise in the revolutionary struggle against capital and to rally around themselves in this struggle *all* working and exploited people.

We are living at a wonderful time, when this prophecy of the great socialists is beginning to be realised. We all see the dawn of the world socialist revolution of the proletariat breaking in several countries. The unspeakable horrors of the imperialist butchery of nations are everywhere evoking

a heroic upsurge of the oppressed and multiplying their strength in the struggle for emancipation.

Let this memorial to Marx and Engels again and again remind the millions of workers and peasants that we are not alone in our struggle. Side by side with us the workers of more advanced countries are rising. Hard battles still lie ahead of them and us. In common struggle capitalist oppression will be broken, and socialism finally won!

Brief report published
November 9, 1918 in
Pravda No. 242

Published according to
the manuscript

**SPEECH AT THE UNVEILING
OF A MEMORIAL PLAQUE TO THOSE WHO FELL
IN THE OCTOBER REVOLUTION
NOVEMBER 7, 1918**

Comrades, we are here to unveil a memorial to those who fell in the October Revolution, 1917. The best sons of the working people laid down their lives in starting a revolution to liberate nations from imperialism, to put an end to wars among nations, to overthrow capital and to win socialism.

For several decades now the history of Russia has had a long list of revolutionary martyrs. Thousands upon thousands died fighting tsarism. Their death roused new fighters and drew more and more people into the struggle.

Those comrades who fell last October brought the magnificent happiness of victory. The greatest honour of which the revolutionary leaders of mankind dreamed was won by them: over the bodies of those comrades who gallantly fell in battle passed thousands and millions of new and just as fearless fighters who won victory by their mass heroism.

Today, all over the world, the workers are seething with anger. The workers' socialist revolution is beginning in several countries. The capitalists of the whole world in terror and hatred hurriedly rally together for the revolution's suppression. And the Socialist Soviet Republic of Russia is a particular thorn in their side. The combined imperialists of the world are prepared to attack us, to involve us in more battles, and to impose more sacrifices on us.

Comrades, let us honour the memory of the October fighters by swearing before their memorial that we shall

follow in their footsteps and emulate their courage and heroism. Let their motto be our motto, the motto of the rebelling workers of the world—"Victory or Death!"

And with this motto the fighters for the proletarian world socialist revolution will be invincible.

Brief report published
November 8, 1918 in
Vecherniye Izvestia Moshovskovo
Soveta No. 93

Published according to
the manuscript

**SPEECH AT A RALLY AND CONCERT
FOR THE ALL-RUSSIA EXTRAORDINARY COMMISSION
STAFF
NOVEMBER 7, 1918**

(Storm of applause.) Comrades, in celebrating the anniversary of our revolution, I would like to say a few words about the onerous duties of the Extraordinary Commissions.

It is not at all surprising to hear Cheka's activities frequently attacked by friends as well as enemies. We have taken on a hard job. When we took over the government of the country, we naturally made many mistakes, and it is only natural that the mistakes of the Extraordinary Commissions strike the eye most. The narrow-minded intellectual fastens on these mistakes without trying to get to the root of the matter. What does surprise me in all these outcries about Cheka's mistakes is the manifest inability to put the question on a broad footing. People harp on individual mistakes Cheka makes, and raise a hue and cry about them.

We, however, say that we learn from our mistakes. In this department, as in all others, we say we shall learn by self-criticism. It is not a matter, of course, of Cheka's personnel but the nature of its functions, which demand determined, swift and, above all, faithful action. When I consider its activities and see how they are attacked, I say this is all narrow-minded and futile talk. It reminds me of Kautsky's homily on the dictatorship, which is tantamount to supporting the bourgeoisie. We surely know from experience that the expropriation of the bourgeoisie entails a drastic struggle—a dictatorship.

Marx said that the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat lies between capitalism and communism. The more the proletariat presses the bourgeoisie, the more furiously they will resist. We know what vengeance was wreaked on the workers in France in 1848. And when people charge us with harshness we wonder how they can forget the rudiments of Marxism. We have not forgotten the mutiny of the officer cadets⁶⁸ in October, and we must not forget that a number of revolts are now being engineered. We have, on the one hand, to learn to work constructively, and, on the other, to smash the bourgeoisie's resistance. The Finnish whiteguards, for all their much-vaunted democracy, had no scruples about shooting down workers. The realisation of the need for dictatorship has taken deep root in the people's minds, arduous and difficult though it is. That alien elements should try to worm their way into Cheka is quite natural. With the help of self-criticism we shall dig them out. The important thing for us is that Cheka is directly exercising the dictatorship of the proletariat, and in that respect its services are invaluable. There is no way of emancipating the people except by forcibly suppressing the exploiters. That is what Cheka is doing, and therein lies its service to the proletariat.

Brief report published
November 9, 1918 in
Izvestia No. 244

Published according to
the typewritten copy
of the minutes

SPEECH AT A MEETING OF DELEGATES
FROM THE POOR PEASANTS' COMMITTEES
OF CENTRAL GUBERNIAS
NOVEMBER 8, 1918¹⁹

Comrades, the organisation of the poor peasants is the key problem in our internal construction work, and even in our whole revolution.

The aim of the October Revolution was to wrench the factories from the hands of the capitalists so as to make the means of production the property of the whole people, and to reconstruct agriculture on socialist lines by handing over the land to the peasants.

The first part of this aim was much easier to accomplish than the second. In the cities, the revolution was dealing with large-scale industry employing tens and hundreds of thousands of workers. The factories belonged to a small number of capitalists, who gave the workers little trouble. The workers had already gained experience in their long struggle against the capitalists, which had taught them to act concertedly, resolutely, and in an organised way. Moreover, they did not have to split up the factories; the thing that mattered was to make all production serve the interests of the working class and the peasants and see that the products of labour should not fall into capitalist hands.

But agriculture is quite a different proposition. A number of transitional measures are required if socialism is to win here. To transform a vast number of small peasant farms into large farms is something that cannot be done immediately. Agriculture, which has hitherto been conducted on a haphazard basis, cannot immediately or in a short space

of time be socialised and transformed into large-scale state enterprise, whose produce would be equally and justly distributed among all working people under a system of universal and equal labour service.

While the factory workers in the cities have already succeeded in completely overthrowing the capitalists and getting rid of exploitation, in the countryside the real fight against exploitation has only just begun.

After the October Revolution we finished off the land-owner and took away his land. That, however, did not end the rural struggle. Gaining the land, like every other workers' gain, can only be secure when it is based on the independent action of the working people themselves, on their own organisation, on their endurance and revolutionary determination.

Did the peasants have this organisation?

Unfortunately not. And that is the trouble, the reason why the struggle is so difficult.

Peasants who do not employ the labour of others, who do not profit at the expense of others, will, of course, always be in favour of the land being divided among all equally, of everybody working, of land tenure not serving as a basis of exploitation; they are against the concentration of land in the hands of a few. But it is different with the kulaks and the parasites who grew rich on the war, who took advantage of the famine to sell grain at fabulous prices, who concealed grain in anticipation of higher prices, and who are now doing all they can to grow rich on the people's misfortunes and on the starvation of the village poor and urban workers.

They, the kulaks and parasites, are no less formidable enemies than the capitalists and landowners. And if the kulaks are not dealt with properly, if we do not cope with the parasites, the return of the tsar and the capitalists is inevitable.

The experience of every revolution that has occurred in Europe offers striking corroboration of the fact that revolution is inevitably doomed if the peasants do not throw off the domination of the kulaks.

Every European revolution ended in failure because the peasants could not cope with their enemies. In the cities the workers overthrew their kings (in England and France they executed their kings several centuries ago; it was

only we who were late with our tsar), yet after a certain interval the old order came back. That was because in those days even in the cities there was no large-scale industry which could unite millions of workers in the factories and weld them into an army powerful enough to withstand the onslaught of the capitalists and the kulaks even without peasant support.

The poor peasants were unorganised, fought the kulaks badly, and as a result the revolution was defeated in the cities as well.

Now the situation is different. During the last two hundred years large-scale production has developed so powerfully and has covered all countries with such a network of huge factories employing thousands and tens of thousands of workers that today everywhere in the cities there are many organised workers, the proletarians, who constitute a force strong enough to achieve final victory over the bourgeoisie, the capitalists.

In former revolutions the poor peasants had nowhere to turn for support in their difficult struggle against the kulaks.

The organised proletariat—which is stronger and more experienced than the peasants (having gained experience in earlier struggles)—now holds power in Russia and possesses all the means of production, the mills, factories, railways, ships, etc.

Now the poor peasants have a reliable and powerful ally in their anti-kulak struggle. They know that the town is behind them, that the proletariat will help them, and is in fact already helping them with every means in its power. That has been shown by recent events.

You all remember, comrades, in what a dangerous situation the revolution was this July. The Czech revolt was spreading, the food shortage in the cities was worsening and the kulaks were becoming more insolent and violent than ever in their attacks on the towns, the Soviet government and the poor peasants.

We appealed to the poor peasants to organise. We proceeded to form Poor Peasants' Committees and organise workers' food detachments. The Left Socialist-Revolutionaries started an uprising. They said the Poor Peasants'

Committees consisted of idlers and the workers were robbing the working peasants of grain.

We replied that they were defending the kulaks, who realised that the Soviet government could be fought by starvation as well as arms. They talked about "idlers". And we asked, "But why does an individual become an 'idler', why does he deteriorate, why is he impoverished, and why does he take to drink? Isn't it because of the kulaks?" The kulaks, in unison with the Left Socialist-Revolutionaries, raised an outcry against "idlers", but they themselves were raking in grain, concealing it and profiteering because they wanted to grow rich on the starvation and suffering of the workers.

The kulaks were squeezing the poor peasants dry. They were profiting from the labour of others, at the same time crying, "Idlers!"

The kulaks waited impatiently for the Czechs. They would most willingly have enthroned a new tsar so as to continue their exploitation with impunity, to continue to dominate the farm labourer and to continue to grow rich.

The only salvation was in the village uniting with the town, the rural proletarians and semi-proletarians (those who do not employ the labour of others) joining the town workers in a campaign against the kulaks and parasites.

To achieve this unity a great deal had to be done about the food situation. The workers in the towns were starving, while the kulak said: "If I hold my grain back a bit longer they may pay more."

The kulaks, of course, are in no hurry; they have plenty of money; they say themselves they have tons of Kerensky notes.⁷⁰

But people who during famine can conceal and hoard grain are vicious criminals. They must be fought as the worst enemies of the people.

And we have begun this fight in the countryside.

The Mensheviks and S.R.s tried to frighten us by saying that in forming the Poor Peasants' Committees we were splitting the peasants. But if we don't split the peasants? The countryside will be left at the kulak's mercy. And that is exactly what we do not want, so we decided to split them. We said: true, we are losing the kulaks—we cannot avoid that misfortune (*laughter*)—but we shall win thousands

and millions of poor peasants who will side with the workers. (*Applause.*)

And that is exactly what is taking place. The split among the peasants only served to bring out more clearly who are the poor peasants, who are the middle peasants not employing the labour of others, and who are the parasites and kulaks.

The workers have been helping the poor peasants in their struggle against the kulaks. In the civil war that has flared up in the countryside the workers are on the side of the poor peasants, as they were when they passed the S.R.-sponsored law on the socialisation of the land.

We Bolsheviks were opposed to this law. Yet we signed it, because we did not want to oppose the will of the majority of peasants. The majority will is binding on us always, and to oppose the majority will is to betray the revolution.

We did not want to impose on the peasants the idea that the equal division of the land was useless, an idea which was alien to them. Far better, we thought, if, by their own experience and suffering, the peasants themselves come to realise that equal division is nonsense. Only then could we ask them how they would escape the ruin and kulak domination that follow from the division of the land.

Division of the land was all very well as a beginning. Its purpose was to show that the land was being taken from the landowners and handed over to the peasants. But that is not enough. The solution lies only in socialised farming.

You did not realise this at the time, but you are coming round to it by force of experience. The way to escape the disadvantages of small-scale farming lies in communes, artels or peasant associations. That is the way to improve agriculture, economise forces and combat the kulaks, parasites and exploiters.

We were well aware that the peasants live rooted to the soil. The peasants fear innovations and tenaciously cling to old habits. We knew the peasants would only believe in the benefits of any particular measure when their own common sense led them to understand and appreciate the benefits. And that is why we helped to divide the land, although we realised this was no solution.

Now the poor peasants themselves are beginning to agree with us. Experience is teaching them that while ten ploughs,

say, are required when the land is divided into one hundred separate holdings, a smaller number suffices under communal farming because the land is not divided up so minutely. A commune permits a whole artel or association to make improvements in agriculture that are beyond the capacity of individual small owners, and so on.

Of course, it will not be possible to change everywhere to socialised farming immediately. The kulaks will put up every resistance—and frequently the peasants themselves stubbornly resist the introduction of communal farming principles. But the more the peasants are convinced by example and by their own experience of the advantages of communes, the greater progress will be.

The Poor Peasants' Committees have an immensely important part to play. They must cover the whole of Russia. For some time their development has been quite rapid. The other day a Congress of Poor Peasants' Committees of the Northern Region was held in Petrograd. Instead of the 7,000 representatives expected, 20,000 actually turned up, and the hall booked for the purpose could not accommodate them all. The fine weather came to the rescue and the meeting was held in the square outside the Winter Palace.

The Congress showed that the rural civil war is being properly understood: the poor peasants are uniting and fighting together against the kulaks, the rich and the parasites.

Our Party Central Committee has drawn up a plan for reforming the Poor Peasants' Committees which will be submitted for the approval of the Sixth Congress of Soviets. We have decided that the Poor Peasants' Committees and the rural Soviets must not exist separately, otherwise there will be squabbling and too much useless talk. We shall merge the Poor Peasants' Committees with the Soviets and turn the Poor Peasants' Committees into Soviets.

We know kulaks sometimes worm their way even into the Poor Peasants' Committees. If this continues the poor peasants will have the same sort of attitude towards the Committees as they had towards the kulak Soviets of Kerensky and Avksentyev. A change of name will fool nobody. It is therefore proposed to hold new elections to the Poor Peasants' Committees. The right to vote will only go to those who do not exploit the labour of others, who do not

make the starving people a source of plunder, and who do not profiteer on or conceal grain surpluses. There must be no place for kulaks and parasites in the proletarian Poor Peasants' Committees.

The Soviet government has decided to assign one thousand million rubles to a special fund for improving farming. All existing and newly formed communes will receive monetary and technical assistance.

We shall send trained experts if they are required. Although most of these experts are counter-revolutionary, the Poor Peasants' Committees should be able to harness them and they will work for the people no worse than they used to work for the exploiters. Our specialists are now quite sure they cannot overthrow the workers' government by sabotage or wilful damage to work.

We are not afraid of foreign imperialism either. Germany has already burnt her fingers in the Ukraine. Instead of the sixty million poods of grain which Germany hoped to carry off from the Ukraine, she got only nine million poods, and Russian Bolshevism into the bargain, for which she was not so keen. (*Storm of applause.*) The British should watch out the same thing does not happen to them. We might warn them not to choke themselves! (*Laughter and applause.*)

The danger, however, continues to exist as long as our brothers abroad have not everywhere rebelled. And we must therefore continue to organise and strengthen our Red Army. The poor peasants should be particularly concerned in this matter for they can only carry on farming under the protection of our army.

Comrades, the transition to the new form of agriculture may perhaps proceed slowly, but the beginnings of communal farming must be carried into practice unswervingly.

There must be no let-up in the fight against the kulaks, and no deals must be made with them.

We can work together with the middle peasants, and with them fight the kulaks. We have nothing against the middle peasants. They may not be socialists, and may never become socialists, but experience will teach them the advantages of socialised farming and the majority of them will not resist.

We tell the kulaks: We have nothing against you either, but hand over your surplus grain, don't profiteer and don't exploit the labour of others. Until you do so we shall hit you with everything we've got.

We are taking nothing from the working peasants; but we shall completely expropriate all those who employ hired labour and who grow rich at the expense of others. (*Stormy applause.*)

Byednota No. 185,
November 10, 1918

Published according to
the *Byednota* text

**TELEGRAM TO ALL
SOVIETS OF DEPUTIES, TO EVERYONE**

10.11.18

News came from Germany in the night about the victory of the revolution there. First Kiel radio announced that power was in the hands of a Council of Workers and Sailors. Then Berlin made the following announcement:

"Greetings of peace and freedom to all. Berlin and the surrounding districts are in the hands of a Council of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies. Adolf Hoffmann, Deputy to the Seym. Joffe and the Embassy staff are returning at once."

Please take every step to notify German soldiers at all border points. Berlin also reports that German soldiers at the front have arrested the peace delegation from the former German Government and have begun peace negotiations themselves with the French soldiers.

Lenin,
Chairman of the Council
of People's Commissars

Pravda No. 244,
November 12, 1918

Published according to
the manuscript

SPEECH AT THE FIRST ALL-RUSSIA CONGRESS
OF WORKING WOMEN¹
NOVEMBER 19, 1918

(Comrade Lenin is greeted by the delegates with stormy applause.) Comrades, in a certain sense this Congress of the women's section of the workers' army has a special significance, because one of the hardest things in every country has been to stir the women into action. There can be no socialist revolution unless very many working women take a big part in it.

In all civilised countries, even the most advanced, women are actually no more than domestic slaves. Women do not enjoy full equality in any capitalist state, not even in the freest of republics.

One of the primary tasks of the Soviet Republic is to abolish all restrictions on women's rights. The Soviet government has completely abolished divorce proceedings, that source of bourgeois degradation, repression and humiliation.

It will soon be a year now since complete freedom of divorce was legislated. We have passed a decree annulling all distinction between legitimate and illegitimate children and removing political restrictions. Nowhere else in the world have equality and freedom for working women been so fully established.

We know that it is the working-class woman who has to bear the full brunt of antiquated codes.

For the first time in history, our law has removed everything that denied women rights. But the important thing is not the law. In the cities and industrial areas this law on complete freedom of marriage is doing all right, but in

the countryside it all too frequently remains a dead letter. There the religious marriage still predominates. This is due to the influence of the priests, an evil that is harder to combat than the old legislation.

We must be extremely careful in fighting religious prejudices; some people cause a lot of harm in this struggle by offending religious feelings. We must use propaganda and education. By lending too sharp an edge to the struggle we may only arouse popular resentment; such methods of struggle tend to perpetuate the division of the people along religious lines, whereas our strength lies in unity. The deepest source of religious prejudice is poverty and ignorance; and that is the evil we have to combat.

The status of women up to now has been compared to that of a slave; women have been tied to the home, and only socialism can save them from this. They will only be completely emancipated when we change from small-scale individual farming to collective farming and collective working of the land. That is a difficult task. But now that Poor Peasants' Committees are being formed, the time has come when the socialist revolution is being consolidated.

The poorest part of the rural population is only now beginning to organise, and socialism is acquiring a firm foundation in these organisations of poor peasants.

Before, often the town became revolutionary and then the countryside.

But the present revolution relies on the countryside, and therein lie its significance and strength. The experience of all liberation movements has shown that the success of a revolution depends on how much the women take part in it. The Soviet government is doing everything in its power to enable women to carry on independent proletarian socialist work.

The Soviet government is in a difficult position because the imperialists of all countries hate Soviet Russia and are preparing to go to war with her for kindling the fire of revolution in a number of countries and for taking determined steps towards socialism.

Now that they are out to destroy revolutionary Russia, the ground is beginning to burn under their own feet. You know how the revolutionary movement is spreading in Ger-

many. In Denmark the workers are fighting their government. In Switzerland and Holland the revolutionary movement is getting stronger. The revolutionary movement in these small countries has no importance in itself, but it is particularly significant because there was no war in these countries and they had the most "constitutional" democratic system. If countries like these are stirring into action, it makes us sure the revolutionary movement is gaining ground all over the world.

No other republic has so far been able to emancipate woman. The Soviet government is helping her. Our cause is invincible because the invincible working class is rising in all countries. This movement signifies the spread of the invincible socialist revolution. (*Prolonged applause. All sing the "Internationale".*)

Newspaper report published
November 20, 1918
in *Izvestia* No. 253

Published according to
the typewritten copy of
the minutes checked with
the newspaper text

SPEECH AT A RALLY IN LENIN'S HONOUR
NOVEMBER 20, 1918⁷²
BRIEF NEWSPAPER REPORT

(Comrade Lenin is greeted with stormy applause passing into ovation.) Comrades, I should like to say a few words about a letter in today's *Pravda*. The letter is written by Pitirim Sorokin, a prominent member of the Constituent Assembly and Right Socialist-Revolutionary Party. Sorokin informs his constituents that he is relinquishing his seat in the Constituent Assembly and withdrawing completely from politics. Apart from being an extremely interesting "human document", the letter has a great deal of political significance.

As is fairly well known, Pitirim Sorokin was the main force on the staff of the Right-wing S. R. *Volya Naroda*⁷³ which connived with the Cadets. To admit this in the press is quite a *volte-face*, a big change, which is taking place among people who had been violently hostile to the Soviet government up till now. In saying that in many cases the policy of certain statesmen is socially harmful, Pitirim Sorokin shows that he is publicly and honestly admitting at last that the whole policy of the Right-wing S.R.s was socially harmful.

Through recent events, many members of this party are beginning to realise that the time has come when the Bolshevik stand is being proved right and all the blunders and errors of its inveterate enemies are being exposed.

Sorokin's letter goes to show that at the given moment we can count on at least a neutral attitude to the Soviet government from a whole number of groups now antagonistic.

The monstrous Brest-Litovsk Peace Treaty turned many away from us, many did not believe in revolution, many piously trusted the pure intentions of the Allies; and now all this has been exposed and everyone can see that the notorious Allies, having dictated even more monstrous peace terms to Germany than those at Brest-Litovsk, are just as rapacious as the German imperialists.

As we all know, the Allies are supporters of the monarchy in Russia: in Archangel, for instance, they are actively backing the monarchists. The British are attacking Russia to take the place of the vanquished German imperialists. All this has opened the eyes of even the most inveterate and uninformed enemies of the revolution.

Many people had been blind supporters of the Constituent Assembly up till now, although we had always said it was just a slogan of the landowners, the monarchists and the entire bourgeoisie with Milyukov at their head, who is selling Russia left, right and centre to the highest bidder.

The "Republic" of America is oppressing the working class. Now everyone knows what a democratic republic actually is. Now it is apparent to everyone that either victorious imperialism or Soviet power can exist—there's no middle way. (*Lenin's speech is repeatedly interrupted by stormy ovations.*)

Pravda No. 253,
November 22, 1918

Published according to
the *Pravda* text

THE VALUABLE ADMISSIONS OF PITIRIM SOROKIN

Pravda today carries a remarkably interesting letter by Pitirim Sorokin, to which the special attention of all Communists should be drawn. In this letter, which was originally published in *Izvestia of the North Dvina Executive Committee*,⁷⁴ Pitirim Sorokin announces that he is leaving the Right Socialist-Revolutionary Party and relinquishing his seat in the Constituent Assembly. His motives are that he finds it difficult to provide effective political recipes, not only for others, but even for himself, and that therefore he "is withdrawing completely from politics". He writes: "The past year of revolution has taught me one truth: politicians may make mistakes, politics may be socially useful, but may also be socially harmful, whereas scientific and educational work is always useful and is always needed by the people...." The letter is signed: "Pitirim Sorokin, lecturer at St. Petersburg University and the Psycho-Neurological Institute, former member of the Constituent Assembly and former member of the Socialist-Revolutionary Party".

This letter is worth mentioning in the first place because it is an extremely interesting "human document". We do not often meet such sincerity and frankness as are displayed by Sorokin in admitting the mistakenness of his politics. In practically the majority of cases politicians who become convinced that the line they have been pursuing is erroneous try to conceal their change of front, to hush it up, to "invent" more or less extraneous motives, and so on. A frank and honest admission of one's political error is in itself an important political act. Pitirim Sorokin is wrong when he says that scientific work "is always useful".

For mistakes are made in this sphere too, and there are examples also in Russian literature of the obstinate advocacy of, for instance, reactionary philosophical views by people who are not conscious reactionaries. On the other hand, a frank declaration by a prominent person—i.e., a person who has occupied a responsible political post known to the people at large—that he is withdrawing from politics *is also politics*. An honest confession of a political error may be of great political benefit to many people if the error was shared by whole parties which at one time enjoyed influence over the people.

The political significance of Pitirim Sorokin's letter is very great precisely at the present moment. It is a "lesson" which we should all seriously think over and learn thoroughly.

It is a truth long known to every Marxist that in every capitalist society the only *decisive* forces are the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, while all social elements occupying a position between these classes and coming within the economic category of the petty bourgeoisie *inevitably* vacillate between these decisive forces. But there is an enormous gulf between academic recognition of this truth and the ability to draw the conclusions that follow from it in the complex conditions of practical reality.

Pitirim Sorokin is representative of the Menshevik-Socialist-Revolutionary trend, an extremely broad public and political trend. That this is a single trend, that the difference between the Mensheviks and the Socialist-Revolutionaries in their attitude towards the struggle between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat is insignificant, is especially convincingly and strikingly borne out by the events in the Russian revolution since February 1917. The Mensheviks and the Socialist-Revolutionaries are varieties of petty-bourgeois democrats—that is the economic essence and fundamental political characteristic of the trend in question. We know from the history of the advanced countries how frequently this trend in its early stages assumes a "socialist" hue.

What was it that several months ago so forcibly repelled those of this trend from the Bolsheviks, from the proletarian revolution, and what is it that is now inducing them to

shift from hostility to neutrality? It is quite obvious that the cause of this shift was, firstly, the collapse of German imperialism in connection with the revolution in Germany and other countries, and the exposure of Anglo-French imperialism, and, secondly, the dispelling of bourgeois-democratic illusions.

Let us deal with the first cause. Patriotism is one of the most deeply ingrained sentiments, inculcated by the existence of separate fatherlands for hundreds and thousands of years. One of the most pronounced, one might say exceptional, difficulties of our proletarian revolution is that it was obliged to pass through a phase of extreme departure from patriotism, the phase of the Brest-Litovsk Peace. The bitterness, resentment, and violent indignation provoked by this peace were easy to understand and it goes without saying that we Marxists could expect only the class-conscious vanguard of the proletariat to appreciate the truth that we were making and were obliged to make great national sacrifices for the sake of the supreme interests of the world proletarian revolution. There was no source from which ideologists who are not Marxists, and the broad mass of the working people, who do not belong to the proletariat trained in the long school of strikes and revolution, could derive either a firm conviction that the revolution was maturing, or an unreserved devotion to it. At best, our tactics appeared to them a fantastic, fanatical, and adventurist sacrifice of the real and most obvious interests of hundreds of millions for the sake of an abstract, utopian, and dubious hope of something that might occur abroad. And the petty bourgeoisie, owing to their economic position, are more patriotic than the bourgeoisie or the proletariat.

But it turned out as we had said.

German imperialism, which had seemed to be the only enemy, collapsed. The German revolution, which had appeared to be a "dream-farce" (to use Plekhanov's expression), became a fact. Anglo-French imperialism, which the fantasy of the petty-bourgeois democrats had pictured as a friend of democracy and a protector of the oppressed, turned out to be a savage beast which imposed on the German Republic and the people of Austria terms worse than those of Brest, a savage beast which used armies of "free" republicans—French

and American—as gendarmes, butchers and throttlers of the independence and freedom of small and weak nations. Anglo-French imperialism was exposed by world history with ruthless thoroughness and frankness. The facts of world history demonstrated to the Russian patriots, who formerly would hear of nothing that was not to the direct advantage (as formerly understood) of their country, that the transformation of our Russian revolution into a socialist revolution was not a dubious venture but a necessity, for *there was no other alternative*: Anglo-French and American imperialism will *inevitably* destroy the independence and freedom of Russia if the world socialist revolution, world Bolshevism, does not triumph.

Facts are stubborn things, as the English say. And during recent months we have witnessed facts that signify a most momentous turning-point in world history. These facts are compelling the petty-bourgeois democrats of Russia, in spite of their hatred of Bolshevism, a hatred inculcated by the history of our inner-Party struggle, to turn from hostility to Bolshevism first to neutrality and then to support of Bolshevism. The objective conditions which repelled these democratic patriots from us most strongly have now vanished. The objective conditions existing in the world now *compel* them to turn to us. Pitirim Sorokin's change of front is by no means fortuitous, but rather the symptom of an inevitable change of front on the part of a *whole class*, of the whole petty-bourgeois democracy. Whoever fails to reckon with this fact and to take advantage of it is a bad socialist, not a Marxist.

Furthermore, faith in "democracy" *in general*, as a universal panacea, and failure to understand that this democracy is *bourgeois* democracy, historically limited in its usefulness and its necessity, have for decades and centuries been particularly characteristic of the petty bourgeoisie of all countries. The big bourgeois is case-hardened; he knows that under capitalism a democratic republic, like every other form of state, is nothing but a machine for the suppression of the proletariat. The big bourgeois *knows* this from his most intimate acquaintance with the real leaders and with the most profound (and therefore frequently the most concealed) springs of *every* bourgeois state machine. The petty

bourgeois, owing to his economic position and his conditions of life generally, is less able to appreciate this truth, and even cherishes the illusion that a democratic republic implies "pure democracy", "a free people's state", the non-class or supra-class rule of the people, a pure manifestation of the will of the people, and so on and so forth. The tenacity of these prejudices of the petty-bourgeois democrat is inevitably due to the fact that he is farther removed from the acute class struggle, the stock exchange, and "real" politics; and it would be absolutely un-Marxist to expect these prejudices to be eradicated very rapidly by propaganda alone.

World history, however, is moving with such furious rapidity, is smashing everything customary and established with a hammer of such immense weight, by crises of such unparalleled intensity, that the most tenacious prejudices are giving way. The naïve belief in a Constituent Assembly and the naïve habit of contrasting "pure democracy" with "proletarian dictatorship" took shape naturally and inevitably in the mind of the "democrat in general". But the experiences of the Constituent Assembly supporters in Archangel, Samara, Siberia and the South could not but destroy even the most tenacious of prejudices. The idealised democratic republic of Wilson *proved* in practice to be a form of the most rabid imperialism, of the most shameless oppression and suppression of weak and small nations. The average "democrat" in general, the Menshevik and the Socialist-Revolutionary, thought: "How can we even dream of some allegedly superior type of state, some Soviet government? God grant us even an ordinary democratic republic!" And, of course, in "ordinary", comparatively peaceful times he could have kept on cherishing this "hope" for many a long decade.

Now, however, the course of world events and the bitter lessons derived from the alliance of all the Russian monarchists with Anglo-French and American imperialism are proving *in practice* that a democratic republic is a bourgeois-democratic republic, which is already out of date from the point of view of the problems which imperialism has placed before history. They show that there is no *other* alternative: either Soviet government triumphs in every advanced country

in the world, or the most reactionary imperialism triumphs, the most savage imperialism, which is throttling the small and weak nations and reinstating reaction all over the world—Anglo-American imperialism, which has perfectly mastered the art of using the form of a democratic republic.

One or the other.

There is no middle course. Until quite recently this view was regarded as the blind fanaticism of the Bolsheviks.

But it turned out to be true.

If Pitirim Sorokin has relinquished his seat in the Constituent Assembly, it is not without reason; it is a symptom of a change of front on the part of a whole class, the petty-bourgeois democrats. A split among them is inevitable: one section will come over to our side, another section will remain neutral, while a third will deliberately join forces with the monarchist Constitutional-Democrats, who are selling Russia to Anglo-American capital and seeking to crush the revolution with the aid of foreign bayonets. One of the most urgent tasks of the present day is to take into account and make use of the turn among the Menshevik and Socialist-Revolutionary democrats from hostility to Bolshevism first to neutrality and then to support of Bolshevism.

Every slogan the Party addresses to the people is bound to become petrified, become a dead letter, yet remain valid for many even when the conditions which rendered it necessary have changed. That is an unavoidable evil, and it is impossible to ensure the correctness of Party policy unless we learn to combat and overcome it. The period of our proletarian revolution in which the differences with the Menshevik and Socialist-Revolutionary democrats were particularly acute was a historically necessary period. It was impossible to avoid waging a vigorous struggle against these democrats when they swung to the camp of our enemies and set about restoring a *bourgeois and imperialist* democratic republic. Many of the slogans of this struggle have now become frozen and petrified and prevent us from properly assessing and taking effective advantage of the new period, in which a change of front has begun among these democrats, a change in our direction, not a fortuitous change, but one rooted deep in the conditions of the international situation.

It is not enough to encourage this change of front and amicably greet those who are making it. A politician who knows what he is working for must learn to *bring about* this change of front among the various sections and groups of the broad mass of petty-bourgeois democrats if he is convinced that serious and deep-going historical reasons for such a turn exist. A revolutionary proletarian must know whom to suppress and with whom—and when and how—to conclude an agreement. It would be ridiculous and foolish to refrain from employing terror against and suppressing the landowners and capitalists and their henchmen, who are selling Russia to the foreign imperialist "Allies". It would be farcical to attempt to "convince" or generally to "psychologically influence" them. But it would be equally foolish and ridiculous—if not more so—to insist only on tactics of suppression and terror in relation to the petty-bourgeois democrats when the course of events is compelling them to turn in our direction.

The proletariat encounters these democrats everywhere. Our task in the rural districts is to destroy the landowner and smash the resistance of the exploiter and the kulak profiteer. For this purpose we can safely rely *only* on the semi-proletarians, the "poor peasants". But the middle peasant is not our enemy. He wavered, is wavering, and will continue to waver. The task of influencing the waverers is *not identical* with the task of overthrowing the exploiter and defeating the active enemy. The task at the present moment is to come to an agreement with the middle peasant—while not for a moment renouncing the struggle against the kulak and at the same time firmly relying solely on the poor peasant—for a turn in our direction on the part of the middle peasants is now inevitable owing to the causes enumerated above.

This applies also to the handicraftsman, the artisan, and the worker whose conditions are most petty-bourgeois or whose views are most petty-bourgeois, and to many office workers and army officers, and, in particular, to the intellectuals generally. It is an unquestionable fact that there often are instances in our Party of inability to make use of this change of front among them and that this inability can and must be overcome.

We already have the firm support of the vast majority of the proletarians organised in the trade unions. We must know how to win over the least proletarian and most petty-bourgeois sections of the *working people* who are turning towards us, to include them in the general organisation and to subject them to general proletarian discipline. The slogan of the moment here is not to fight these sections, but to win them over, to be able to influence them, to convince the waverers, to make use of those who are neutral, and, by mass proletarian influence, to educate those who are lagging behind or who have only very recently begun to free themselves from "Constituent Assembly" or "patriotic-democratic" illusions.

We already have sufficiently firm support among the working people. This was quite strikingly borne out by the Sixth Congress of Soviets. We are not afraid of the bourgeois intellectuals, but we shall not for a moment relax the struggle against the deliberate saboteurs and white-guards among them. But the slogan of the moment is to make use of the change of attitude towards us which is taking place among them. There still remain plenty of the worst bourgeois specialists who have wormed themselves into Soviet positions. To throw them out, to replace them by specialists who yesterday were our convinced enemies and today are only neutral is one of the most important tasks of the present moment, the task of every active Soviet functionary who comes into contact with the "specialists", of every agitator, propagandist, and organiser.

Of course, like every other political action in a complex and rapidly changing situation, agreement with the middle peasant, with the worker who was a Menshevik yesterday and with the office worker or specialist who was a saboteur yesterday, takes skill to achieve. The whole point is not to rest content with the skill we have acquired by previous experience, but *under all circumstances to go on, under all circumstances to strive for something bigger*, under all circumstances to proceed from simpler to more difficult tasks. Otherwise, no progress whatever is possible and in particular no progress is possible in socialist construction.

The other day I was visited by representatives from a congress of delegates of credit co-operative societies. They

showed me the congress resolution⁷⁵ protesting *against the merger* of the Credit Co-operative Bank with the People's Bank of the Republic. I told them that I stood for agreement with the middle peasants and highly valued even the beginnings of a change in attitude from hostility to neutrality towards the Bolsheviks on the part of the co-operators, but the basis for an agreement could be created only by their consent to the complete merger of their special bank with the single Bank of the Republic. The congress delegates thereupon replaced their resolution by another, which they had the congress adopt, and in which everything hostile to the merger was deleted; *but ... but* what they proposed was a plan for a *special "credit union"* of co-operators, which in fact differed in no way from a special bank! That was ridiculous. Only a fool, of course, will be deceived by such verbiage. But the "failure" of one such ... "attempt" will not affect our policy in the least; we have pursued and will pursue a policy of agreement with the co-operators, the middle peasants, at the same time suppressing every attempt to change the *policy* of the Soviet government and of Soviet socialist construction.

Vacillation on the part of the petty-bourgeois democrats is inevitable. It was enough for the Czechs to win a few victories for these democrats to fall into a panic, to begin to spread panic, to hasten to the side of the "victors", and be ready to greet them in a servile manner. Of course, it must not be forgotten for a moment that now, too, any partial success of, let us say, the Anglo-American-Krasnov white-guards would be enough for vacillation to begin in the other direction, increasing panic and multiplying cases of the dissemination of panic, of treachery, and desertion to the imperialists, and so on and so forth.

We are aware of that. We shall not forget it. The purely proletarian basis we have won for the Soviet government, which is supported by the semi-proletarians, will remain firm and enduring. Our ranks will not falter, our army will not waver—that we already know from experience. But when profound world-historic changes bring about an inevitable turn in our direction among the mass of non-Party, Menshevik, and Socialist-Revolutionary democrats, we must learn and shall learn to make use of this change of front, to

encourage it, to induce it among the various groups and sections of the population, to do everything possible to reach agreement with them and thus facilitate the work of socialist construction and ease the burden of grievous economic dislocation, ignorance, and incompetence which are delaying the victory of socialism.

Written November 20, 1918

Published November 21, 1918
in *Pravda* No. 252
Signed: N. Lenin

Published according to
the *Pravda* text

SPEECH ON RED OFFICERS' DAY NOVEMBER 24, 1918^{7*}

(Thunderous applause, singing of the "Internationale".)
Greetings on behalf of the People's Commissars. Whenever I think about the tasks of our army and Red officers, I recall something that happened in a train on Finnish Railways not so long ago.

I noticed that the passengers were smiling at something an old Finnish woman was saying, so I asked someone to translate her words. She was comparing the revolutionary soldiers to the old soldiers and saying that the former protected the poor whereas the latter used to protect the interests of the bourgeoisie and the landowners. "Formerly the poor man had to pay heavily for every stick of wood he took without permission," the old woman said. "But when you meet a soldier in the woods nowadays he'll even give you a hand with your bundle of sticks. You don't have to fear the man with the gun any more," she said.

I think it would be hard to imagine any better tribute to the Red Army than that.

Most of the old officers were the spoiled and depraved darling sons of capitalists, who had nothing in common with the private soldier. So in building our new army now, we must draw our officers solely from among the people. Only Red officers will have any respect among the soldiers and be able to strengthen socialism in our army. Such an army will be invincible.

**SPEECH DELIVERED TO A MEETING OF DELEGATES
FROM THE MOSCOW CENTRAL WORKERS'
CO-OPERATIVE**

NOVEMBER 26, 1918¹¹

(Comrade Lenin's appearance is greeted with stormy, prolonged applause.) Comrades, greetings to you representatives of the workers' co-operative societies that have a tremendous part to play in setting the whole business of supply on the proper lines. In the Council of People's Commissars we have frequently, especially just lately, had to discuss questions that concern co-operative societies and the attitude of the workers' and peasants' government towards them.

In this respect we should remember how important the role of the co-operative movement was under capitalism, when it functioned on the principle of fighting the capitalist class economically.

It is certainly true that in their approach to the practical work of distribution, the co-operatives often turned the interests of the people into the interests of a group of individuals, and were often guided by the urge to share trading profits with the capitalists. With purely commercial interests as their guide, the co-operators often forgot about the socialist system that seemed to them to be too far away, or even unattainable.

The co-operatives were often associations of mainly petty-bourgeois people, middle peasants, whose efforts in the co-operative movement were governed by their own petty-bourgeois interests. Nevertheless these co-operatives undoubtedly helped to encourage popular initiative, thereby

rendering a great service. They really did build big economic organisations based on popular initiative, and in this, we must admit, they played an important role.

In some cases these economic organisations developed into institutions capable of replacing or complementing the capitalist apparatus; this is something we should recognise. But in the meantime the urban workers had been drawn into the organisation of large-scale capitalist industry to such an extent that they had grown strong enough to overthrow the landowning and capitalist class, and to be capable of utilising the entire capitalist apparatus.

The urban workers well appreciated that owing to the disorder caused by the imperialist war the supply system had to be put in order and for that purpose they used, first and foremost, the big economic apparatus of the capitalists.

We must keep that in mind. The co-operative movement is a huge cultural legacy that we must treasure and make use of.

Hence we approached the problem cautiously in the Council of People's Commissars when we had to deal with it, knowing full well how important it was to make full use of that efficient economic apparatus.

Yet we had to bear in mind that the chief co-operative workers were Mensheviks, Right S.R.s and members of other compromise and petty-bourgeois parties. We could not forget that while the political groups between the two warring classes used the co-operatives partially as a screen for counter-revolutionaries, even to support the Czechs out of their funds. We had evidence of this all right. This, however, was certainly not the case everywhere and we frequently invited the co-operatives to work with us, if they wished to.

Soviet Russia's international position has recently become such that many petty-bourgeois groups have come to realise the importance of the workers' and peasants' government.

When Soviet Russia was faced with the Brest-Litovsk negotiations and we were forced to conclude that very harsh peace with the German imperialists, the Mensheviks and Right S.R.s were particularly vociferous in attacking us. When Soviet Russia was forced to conclude that peace,

the Mensheviks and S.R.s raised a hue and cry that the Bolsheviks were ruining Russia.

Some of those people thought the Bolsheviks were utopians, dreamers who believed in the possibility of world revolution. Others thought the Bolsheviks were agents of German imperialism.

Furthermore, many of them in those days assumed that the Bolsheviks had made concessions to German imperialism and gloated over this being an agreement with the ruling German bourgeoisie.

I won't mention other expressions unflattering, to say the least, that these groups then hurled at the Soviet government.

Recent events all over the world, however, have taught the Mensheviks and Right S.R.s a great deal. The Menshevik Central Committee appeal to all working people⁷⁸ published recently in our press states that although they have ideological differences with the Communists they consider it necessary to fight world imperialism today headed by the Anglo-American capitalists.

Indeed, events of tremendous importance have occurred. Soviets of Workers' Deputies have been formed in Rumania and Austria-Hungary. In Germany the Soviets have opposed the Constituent Assembly and soon, perhaps in a few weeks, the Haase-Scheidemann government will fall and be replaced by the Liebknecht government. At the same time the British and French capitalists are doing all they can to crush the Russian revolution and thereby halt the world revolution. Everyone now realises that the aspirations of Allied imperialism go even farther than those of German imperialism; the terms imposed on Germany are even worse than those of the Brest-Litovsk Peace Treaty, and on top of that they want to crush the revolution and be world gendarmes. The Mensheviks have shown by their resolution that they realise which way the British winds are blowing. We must not now turn them away, on the contrary, we must meet them halfway and give them a chance to work with us.

Last April the Communists showed they were not averse to working with co-operators. It is the job of the Communists, relying on the support of the urban proletariat, to be able to use all those who can be enlisted for the work,

who formerly adopted socialist slogans but did not have the courage to continue fighting for them until they achieved victory or were defeated. Marx said the proletariat must expropriate the capitalists and make use of petty-bourgeois groups. And we said everything must be taken from the capitalists but only pressure must be brought to bear on the kulaks and they must be kept under the control of the grain monopoly. We must come to an agreement with the middle peasants, bring them under our control, while at the same time actually promoting the ideals of socialism.

We must say forthrightly that the workers and poor peasants will do all they can to really promote the ideals of socialism, and if there are people out of step with these ideals, we shall go it alone. We must, however, make use of everyone who can really help us in this most difficult struggle.

When discussing these questions last April the Council of People's Commissars came to an agreement with the co-operators.⁷⁹ This was the only meeting that was attended by members of the non-government co-operative movement as well as the Communist People's Commissars.

We came to an agreement with them. This was the only meeting that adopted a decision by a minority, by co-operators, and not by a majority of Communists.

The Council of People's Commissars did this because it thought it necessary to make use of the experience and knowledge of the co-operators and of their apparatus.

You also know that a decree⁸⁰ on the organisation of supply was adopted a few days ago and published in Sunday's *Izvestia*, and which allots a considerable role to the co-operatives and the co-operative movement. This is because socialist economic organisation is impossible without a network of co-operative organisations and because there have been a lot of mistakes in this sphere up to now. Some co-operatives have been closed or nationalised even though the Soviets could not cope with distribution and the organisation of Soviet shops.

By the decree everything taken from the co-operatives must be returned to them.

The co-operatives must be denationalised and re-established.

True enough, the decree is cautious towards co-operatives that were closed because counter-revolutionaries had wormed their way into them. We categorically stated that in this respect the work of the co-operatives had to be kept under control, although they must be fully utilised.

All of you well appreciate that one of the proletariat's chief tasks is the immediate and proper organisation of the supply and distribution of food.

Since we do have an apparatus with the necessary experience and which, most important of all, is based on popular initiative, we must set it to fulfilling these tasks. It is particularly important to utilise the initiative of the people who created these organisations. The ordinary people must be drawn into this work, and this is the main task we must set the co-operatives, the workers' co-operatives in particular.

The supply and distribution of food is something everyone understands. Even a man with no book-learning understands. And in Russia most people are still ignorant and illiterate because everything had been done to prevent the working and exploited people from acquiring education.

Yet there are very many live wires among the people who can display tremendous ability, far greater than might be imagined. It is, therefore, the duty of the workers' co-operatives to enlist these people, to nose them out and give them direct work in the supply and distribution of food. Socialist society is one single co-operative.

I do not doubt that popular initiative in the workers' co-operatives will indeed lead to the conversion of the workers' co-operatives into a single Moscow city consumers' commune.

Published in December 1918
as a leaflet and in the journal
Rabochy Mir No. 19

Published according to
the leaflet checked with
the journal

MOSCOW PARTY WORKERS' MEETING NOVEMBER 27, 1918¹¹

1

REPORT ON THE ATTITUDE OF THE PROLETARIAT TO PETTY-BOURGEOIS DEMOCRATS

Comrades, I should like to talk about the tasks facing our Party and the Soviet government in connection with the policy of the proletariat towards the petty-bourgeois democrats. Recent events have undoubtedly brought this question to the fore because the vast changes in the international situation—such as the annulment of the Brest-Litovsk Treaty, the revolution in Germany, the collapse of German imperialism and the disintegration of British and American imperialism—were bound to undermine a number of bourgeois-democratic tenets underlying the theory of the petty-bourgeois democrats. Russia's military position and the onslaught of the British, French and American imperialists were bound to bring some of the petty-bourgeois democrats more or less over to our side. What I should like to talk about this evening are the changes we must make in our tactics and the new tasks before us.

Let me begin with certain fundamental theoretical propositions. There can be no doubt that the chief social group which gives the petty-bourgeois democrats an economic basis is, in Russia, the middle peasants. Undoubtedly the socialist revolution and the transition from capitalism to socialism are bound to assume special forms in a country where the peasant population is numerically large. I should therefore like first to remind you of the main tenets of Marxism with regard to the proletariat's attitude to the middle peasants. I shall do so by reading some of Engels's

statements in his article "The Peasant Question in France and Germany". This article, published in pamphlet form, was written in 1894 or 1895, when the agrarian programme of the socialist party, its attitude towards the peasants, became a practical issue in connection with the discussion of the programme of the German Social-Democratic Party at its Breslau Congress.⁸² This is what Engels had to say about the attitude of the proletariat:

"What, then, is our attitude towards the small peasantry?

"To begin with, the French programme is absolutely correct in stating: that we foresee the inevitable doom of the small peasant but that it is not our mission to hasten it by any interference on our part.

"Secondly, it is just as evident that when we are in possession of state power we shall not even think of forcibly expropriating the small peasants (regardless of whether with or without compensation), as we shall have to do in the case of the big landowners. Our task relative to the small peasant consists, in the first place, in effecting a transition of his private enterprise and private possession to co-operative ones, not forcibly but by dint of example and the proffer of social assistance for this purpose."

Engels says further:

"Neither now nor at any time in the future can we promise the small-holding peasants to preserve their individual property and individual enterprise against the overwhelming power of capitalist production. We can only promise them that we shall not interfere in their property relations by force, against their will."⁸³

And the last statement I would like to quote is the argument about the rich peasants, the big peasants, the kulaks as we call them in Russia, peasants who employ hired labour. Unless these peasants realise the inevitability of the doom of their present mode of production and draw the necessary conclusions, Marxists cannot do anything for them. Our duty is only to facilitate their transition, too, to the new mode of production.⁸⁴

These are the tenets which I wanted to quote to you and which are no doubt known to every Communist. It follows that when the workers come to power, they cannot have the same task in countries where large-scale capitalism predom-

inates and in countries where backward, small, middle and big peasants predominate. Thus, we were interpreting Marxism quite correctly when we said it was our duty to wage war on the landowners, the exploiters.

For the middle peasant we say: no force under any circumstances. For the big peasant we say: our aim is to bring him under the control of the grain monopoly and fight him when he violates the monopoly and conceals grain. I expounded these principles the other day at a meeting of several hundred delegates from Poor Peasants' Committees who had come to Moscow at the time the Sixth Congress was being held.* In our Party literature, as in our propaganda and agitation, we have always stressed the distinction between our attitude to the big bourgeoisie and the petty bourgeoisie. But although we are all in agreement as to theory, not all of us by a long shot have drawn the correct political conclusions, or drawn them rapidly enough. I deliberately began in a roundabout way, so to speak, to show you what economic concepts about class relations must guide us if our policy towards the petty-bourgeois democrats is to be based on a firm foundation.

There can be no doubt that this small-peasant class (by middle peasant we mean one who does not sell his labour power) in Russia, at any rate, constitutes the chief economic class which is the source of the broad diversity of political trends among the petty-bourgeois democrats. Here in Russia these trends are associated mostly with the Menshevik and S.R. parties. The history of socialism in Russia shows a long struggle between the Bolsheviks and these parties, while West-European socialists have always regarded this struggle as one *within* socialism, that is, as a split in the Russian socialist movement. Incidentally, this view is often expressed even by sound Social-Democrats.

Only today I was handed a letter from Friedrich Adler, a man who is well known for his revolutionary activity in Austria. His letter, which was written at the end of October and received today, contains only one request: to release the Mensheviks from prison. He could find nothing more sensible to write about at a moment like this. True,

* See pp. 171-78 of this volume.—*Ed.*

he makes the reservation that he is not well informed about our movement, and so on. But still this is typical. This silly mistake by West-European socialists comes from them looking backwards instead of forwards, and not realising that neither the Mensheviks nor the S.R.s, who preach socialism, can be classed as socialists. All through the 1917 revolution the Mensheviks and S.R.s did nothing but vacillate between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat; they could never stick to a correct stand, as though to deliberately illustrate Marx's words that the petty bourgeoisie are incapable of taking an independent stand in decisive battles.

As soon as they began to form the Soviets, the workers instinctively took up a firm class stand by the very act of establishing them. The Mensheviks and S.R.s, on the other hand, vacillated all the time. And when in the spring and summer of 1917 their own friends labelled them semi-Bolsheviks, this was a true description, not merely a witicism. On every single issue they would say "yes" one day and "no" the next, whether it was the question of the Soviets, the revolutionary movement in the countryside, the direct seizure of land, fraternisation at the front, or whether to support imperialism. They would help on the one hand, and hinder on the other, all the time displaying their spinelessness and helplessness. Yet their propaganda among the people for the Soviets, which they always referred to as revolutionary democracy and contrasted with what they called the propertied elements, was only a cunning political device on their part, and the masses whom they addressed were carried away by this propaganda. Thus the Menshevik preaching was partly of service to us too.

This is a very complex question with a wealth of history behind it. I need only dwell on it briefly. This policy of the Mensheviks and S.R.s before our very eyes is conclusive proof of our assertion that it is wrong to regard them as socialists. If they had at any time been socialists, it was only in their phraseology and reminiscences; in fact they are nothing but Russian petty bourgeois.

I began with the attitude Marxists should adopt towards the middle peasant, or, in other words, towards the petty-bourgeois parties. We are now coming to a stage when our

slogans of the previous period of the revolution must be changed to take proper account of the present turn of events. You know that in October and November these people wavered.

The Bolshevik Party stood firm then and rightly so. We said we should have to destroy the enemies of the proletariat, and were facing a battle on the fundamental issues of war or peace, of bourgeois representation, and of Soviet government. In all these questions we only had our own forces to rely on, and we were absolutely right when we refused to compromise with the petty-bourgeois democrats.

The subsequent course of events confronted us with the question of peace and the conclusion of the Brest-Litovsk Peace Treaty. You know that the Brest-Litovsk Peace Treaty repelled the petty bourgeoisie from us.

The petty-bourgeois democrats sharply recoiled from us as a consequence of these two circumstances: our foreign policy, which led to the conclusion of the Brest-Litovsk Peace Treaty, on the one hand, and our ruthless struggle against democratic illusions on the part of a section of the petty-bourgeois democrats, our ruthless struggle for the Soviet government, on the other. You know that after the Brest-Litovsk Peace, the Left Socialist-Revolutionaries began to waver, some taking to open warfare, and others splitting up, and still splitting up to this day. But the fact remains. Of course, we cannot doubt for one minute or one little bit that our policy was absolutely right. To start proving that now would be to reiterate the fundamentals, because the German revolution has proved more than anything else that our views were correct.

What we were reproached for most after the Brest-Litovsk Peace, and what we heard most often from the less enlightened workers, was that our hopes of a German revolution were in vain and were not being fulfilled. The German revolution has refuted all these reproaches and has proved we were right in our view that it had to come and that we had to fight German imperialism by propaganda and by undermining it from within as well as by a national war. Events have justified us so fully that no further proof is needed. The very same applies to the Constituent Assembly; vacillations on this score were inevitable, and events

have proved the correctness of our views so fully that all the revolutions now starting up in the West are taking place under the slogan of Soviet government and are setting up Soviet government. Soviets are the distinguishing feature of the revolution everywhere. They have spread from Austria and Germany to Holland and Switzerland, countries with the oldest democratic culture, which call themselves Western Europe even in relation to Germany. In these countries the demand for Soviet government is being raised. That means that the historical collapse of bourgeois democracy was an absolute historical necessity, not an invention of the Bolsheviks. In Switzerland and Holland, the political struggle took place hundreds of years ago, and it is not for the sake of the Bolsheviks' beautiful eyes that the demand for Soviet government is being raised there now. That means we gauged the situation rightly. Events have borne out the correctness of our tactics so well that it is not worth dwelling on the subject any further. Only we must realise that this is a serious matter, one affecting the most deep-seated prejudices of the petty-bourgeois democrats. Look at the overall history of the bourgeois revolution and parliamentary development in all the West-European countries, and you will find that a similar prejudice prevailed among the old Social-Democrats of the forties in all countries. These views persisted longest of all in France. All this is only natural.

When it comes to parliamentarism, the petty bourgeoisie are the most patriotic, more patriotic than the proletariat or the big bourgeoisie. The latter are more international. The petty bourgeoisie are less mobile, are not connected to the same extent with other nations and are not drawn into the orbit of world trade. It was therefore impossible to expect anything else than that the petty bourgeoisie should be most up in arms over the question of parliamentarism. And this proved to be the case in Russia too. An important factor was that our revolution had to fight against patriotism. At the time of the Brest-Litovsk Peace we had to go against patriotism. We said that if you are a socialist you must sacrifice all your patriotic feelings to the international revolution, which is inevitable, and although it is not here yet you must believe in it if you are an internationalist.

And, naturally, with this sort of talk, we could only hope to win over the advanced workers. It was only natural that the majority of the petty bourgeoisie should not see eye to eye with us. We could scarcely have expected them to. How could the petty bourgeoisie have been expected to accept our point of view? We had to exercise the dictatorship of the proletariat in its harshest form. It took us several months to live through the period of illusions. But if you examine the history of the West-European countries, you will find they did not get over this illusion even in decades. Take the history of Holland, France, Britain, etc. We had to disperse the petty-bourgeois illusion that the people are an integral whole and that the popular will can be expressed other than in class struggle.

We were absolutely right in rejecting all compromise over this. If we had made any concessions to petty-bourgeois illusions, to illusions about the Constituent Assembly, we would have ruined the whole cause of the proletarian revolution in Russia. We would have sacrificed to narrow national interests the interests of the world revolution, which turned out to be proceeding along the Bolshevik course, because it was purely proletarian instead of national. The result of these conditions was that the Menshevik and S.R. petty-bourgeois people recoiled from us. They crossed the barricades and landed in the camp of our enemies. When the Dutov revolt broke out, we saw clearly enough that the political forces that had been fighting us were in the camp of Dutov, Krasnov and Skoropadsky. The proletariat and poor peasants stood on our side.

You know that during the Czech attack, when it was at the height of its success, kulak revolts broke out all over Russia. It was only the close ties formed between the urban workers and the peasants that consolidated our rule. It was only the proletariat, with the help of the poor peasants, that held off all our enemies. The overwhelming majority of both the Mensheviks and the S.R.s sided with the Czechs, the Dutov and Krasnov gangs. This state of affairs forced us to make a ruthless struggle and use terrorist methods of warfare. No matter how much people may have condemned this terrorism from different points of view—and we were condemned by all the vacillating Social-

Democrats—we knew perfectly well it was necessitated by the acute Civil War. It was necessary because all the petty-bourgeois democrats had turned against us. They used all kinds of methods against us—civil war, bribery and sabotage. It was these conditions that necessitated the terror. Therefore we should not repent or renounce it. Only we must clearly appreciate the conditions of our proletarian revolution that gave rise to these acute forms of struggle. These special conditions were that we had to go against patriotism, that we had to replace the Constituent Assembly with the slogan "All Power to the Soviets!"

The change in international politics was inevitably followed by a change in the position of the petty-bourgeois democrats. A change of heart is now occurring in their camp. In the Menshevik appeal we find a call to renounce alliance with the propertied classes, a call to go and fight British and American imperialism addressed by the Mensheviks to their friends, people from among the petty-bourgeois democrats who had concluded an alliance with the Dutov men, the Czechs and the British. It is now clear to everybody that, except for British and American imperialism, there is no force that can put up any sort of stand against the Bolshevik power. Similar vacillations are going on among the S.R.s and the intellectuals, who most of all share the prejudices of the petty-bourgeois democrats and were swayed by patriotic sentiments. The same sort of thing is going on among them too.

Our Party's job now is to be guided by class relations when choosing tactics, and to be perfectly clear whether this is just chance, spinelessness, groundless vacillation, or, on the contrary, a process with deep social roots. The answer is quite obvious if we examine this question as a whole from the standpoint of theoretically established relations between the proletariat and the middle peasants, and from the standpoint of the history of our revolution. This change of front is *not due to chance or something personal*. It involves millions and millions of people whose status in Russia is either that of middle peasants or something equivalent. The change of front involves all the petty-bourgeois democrats, who opposed us with a bitterness amount-

ing almost to fury because we had to break down all their patriotic sentiments. But history has veered round to bring patriotism back towards us now. It is evident that the Bolsheviks cannot be overthrown except by foreign bayonets. Up till now the petty bourgeoisie had cherished the illusion that the British, French and Americans stood for real democracy. But now that illusion is being completely dispelled by the peace terms that are being imposed on Austria and Germany. The British are behaving as if they had made a special point of proving the correctness of the Bolshevik views on international imperialism.

Hence voices are being raised in the parties that fought us, as in the Plekhanovite camp, for instance, saying: "We were mistaken, we thought that German imperialism was our chief enemy and that the Western countries—France, Britain and America—would bring us a democratic system." Yet now it appears that the peace terms these Western countries offer are a hundred times more humiliating, rapacious and predatory than our peace terms at Brest-Litovsk. It appears that the British and Americans are acting as the hangmen of Russian freedom, as gendarmes, playing the part of the Russian butcher Nicholas I, and are doing it no less effectively than the kings who played the hangmen in throttling the Hungarian revolution. This part is now being played by Wilson's agents. They are crushing the revolution in Austria, they are playing the gendarme, they are issuing an ultimatum to Switzerland: "You'll get no bread from us if you don't join the fight against the Bolshevik Government." They tell Holland: "Don't you dare allow Soviet ambassadors into your country, or we'll blockade you." Theirs is a simple weapon—the noose of famine. That is what they are using to strangle the peoples.

The history of recent times, of the war and post-war period, has developed with extraordinary speed, and it goes to show that British and French imperialism is just as infamous as German imperialism. Don't forget that even in America, where we have the freest and most democratic of all republics, that does not prevent its imperialists from behaving just as brutally. Internationalists are not only lynched, they are dragged into the street by the mob, stripped naked, tarred and burned.

Events are exposing the imperialists most effectively, and posing the alternative: either a Soviet government, or the complete suppression of the revolution by British and French bayonets. There is no longer any question of an agreement with Kerensky. As you know, they have thrown him away like a squeezed lemon. They joined forces with Durov and Krasnov. Now the petty bourgeoisie have got over that phase. Patriotism is now pushing them to us—that is how things have turned out, that is how history has compelled them to act. And we must all draw a lesson from this great experience of all world history. The bourgeoisie cannot be defended, the Constituent Assembly cannot be defended, because it in fact played into the hands of the Durovs and Krasnovs. It seems funny that they should have been for the Constituent Assembly, but that happened because the bourgeoisie were still on top when it was being convened. The Constituent Assembly turned out to be an organ of the bourgeoisie, and the bourgeoisie turned out to be on the side of the imperialists, whose policy was directed against the Bolsheviks. The bourgeoisie were prepared to go to any lengths, to resort to the vilest means to throttle the Soviet government, to sell Russia to anybody, only to destroy the power of the Soviets.

That is the policy that led to civil war and made the petty-bourgeois democrats change round. Of course, there is always bound to be vacillation among them. When the Czechs gained their first victories, the petty-bourgeois intellectuals tried to spread rumours that the Czechs were bound to win. Telegrams from Moscow were issued declaring that the city was surrounded and about to fall. And we know perfectly well that if the British and French gain even the slightest success, the petty-bourgeois intellectuals will be the first to lose their heads, give way to panic and spread all sorts of rumours about enemy gains. But the revolution showed that revolts against imperialism are inevitable. And now our "Allies" have proved to be the chief enemies of Russian freedom and independence.

Russia cannot and will not be independent unless Soviet power is consolidated. That is why this turn about has occurred. So we must now define our tactics. It would be a great mistake to think of mechanically applying slogans

of our revolutionary struggle from the time when there could be no reconciliation between us, when the petty bourgeoisie were against us, and when our firm stand demanded resort to terror. Today, this would not be standing firm but sheer stupidity, a failure to understand Marxist tactics. When we were obliged to sign the Brest-Litovsk Peace Treaty, this step seemed, from the narrow patriotic point of view, to be a betrayal of Russia; but from the point of view of world revolution it was a correct strategical step, which was of the greatest help to the world revolution. The world revolution has broken out just now, when Soviet power has become an institution of the whole people.

Although the petty-bourgeois democrats are still wavering, their illusions have been dispelled. And we must of course take this state of affairs into account, as we must all the other conditions. Formerly we looked at things differently, because the petty bourgeois sided with the Czechs, and we had to use force. After all, war is war, and when at war you have to fight. But now that these people are beginning to swing over to us, we must not turn away from them simply because the slogan in our leaflets and newspapers used to be different. When we find them half turning towards us, we must rewrite our leaflets, because the petty-bourgeois democrats' attitude towards us has changed. We must say: "Come along, we are not afraid of you; if you think the only way we know how to act is by force, you are mistaken; we might reach agreement." Everyone steeped in the traditions of bourgeois prejudice, all the co-operators, all sections of working people particularly connected with the bourgeoisie, might come over to us.

Take the intellectuals. They lived a bourgeois life, they were accustomed to certain comforts. When they swung towards the Czechs, our slogan was *ruthless struggle—terror*. Now that there is this change of heart among the petty-bourgeois masses, our slogan must be one of *agreement*, of establishing good-neighbourly relations. When we come across a declaration from a group of petty-bourgeois democrats to the effect that they want to be neutral towards the Soviet government, we must say: neutrality and good-neighbourly relations are old-fashioned rubbish and absolutely useless from the point of view of communism.

They are just old-fashioned rubbish and nothing else, but we must consider this rubbish from the practical standpoint. That has always been our view, and we never had hopes that these petty-bourgeois people would become Communists. But practical propositions must be considered.

We said of the dictatorship of the proletariat that the proletariat must dominate over all other classes. We cannot obliterate the distinctions between classes until complete communism. Classes will remain until we have got rid of the exploiters—the big bourgeoisie and the land-owners, whom we are ruthlessly expropriating. But we cannot say the same thing of the middle and small peasants. While relentlessly suppressing the bourgeoisie and the landowners, we must win over the petty-bourgeois democrats. And when they say they want to be neutral and live on good-neighbourly terms with us, we shall reply: "That's just what we want. We never expected you to become Communists."

We continue to stand for the ruthless expropriation of the landowners and capitalists. Here we are ruthless, and we cannot agree to any conciliation or compromise. But we realise that no decrees can convert small-scale into large-scale production, that we must gradually, keeping in step with events, win conviction for the inevitability of socialism. These people will never become socialists by conviction, honest to goodness socialists. They will become socialists when they see there is no other way. Now they can see that Europe has been so thoroughly shattered and imperialism has reached such a state that no bourgeois democracy can save the situation, that only a Soviet system can do so. That is why this neutrality, this good-neighbourly attitude of the petty-bourgeois democrats is to be welcomed rather than feared. That is why, if we look at the matter as the representatives of a class which is exercising dictatorship, we must say that we never counted on anything more from the petty-bourgeois democrats. That is quite sufficient as far as we are concerned. You maintain good-neighbourly relations with us, and we shall keep state power. After your declaration in regard to the "Allies" we are quite willing to legalise you, Menshevik gentlemen. Our Party Central Committee will do that. But we shall not forget there are still "activists" in your party, and for

them our methods of struggle will remain the same; for they are friends of the Czechs and until the Czechs are driven out of Russia, you are our enemies too. We reserve state power for ourselves, *and for ourselves alone*. To those who adopt an attitude of neutrality towards us we shall act as a class which holds political power and keeps the sharp edge of its weapon for the landowners and capitalists, and which says to the petty-bourgeois democrats: if it suits you better to side with the Czechs and Krasnov, well, we have shown you we can fight, and we shall carry on fighting. But if you prefer to learn from the Bolshevik example, we shall come some way to meet you, knowing that without a series of agreements, which we shall try out, examine and compare, the country cannot get to socialism.

This is the path we took from the very beginning, for example, by passing the socialisation of the land law and turning it gradually into the means that enabled us to unite the poor peasants around us and turn them against the kulaks. Only as the proletarian movement succeeds in the countryside shall we systematically pass to collective common ownership of land and to socialised farming. This could only be done with the backing of a purely proletarian movement in the countryside, and in this respect a great deal still remains to be done. There can be no doubt that only practical experience, only realities will show us how to act properly.

To reach agreement with the middle peasants is one thing, with the petty-bourgeois elements another, and with the co-operators yet another. There will be some modification of our task in relation to the associations which have preserved petty-bourgeois traditions and habits. It will be even further modified in relation to the petty-bourgeois intellectuals. They vacillate, but we need them, too, for our socialist revolution. We know socialism can only be built from elements of large-scale capitalist culture, and the intellectuals are one of these elements. We had to be ruthless with them, but it was not communism that compelled us to do so, it was events, which repelled from us all "democrats" and everyone enamoured of bourgeois democracy. Now we have the chance to utilise the intellectuals for socialism, intellectuals who are not socialist, who will

never be communist, but whom objective events and relations are now inducing to adopt a neutral and good-neighbourly attitude towards us. We shall never rely on the intellectuals, we shall only rely on the vanguard of the proletariat that leads all workers and poor peasants. The Communist Party can rely on no other support. It is one thing, however, to rely on the class which embodies the dictatorship, and another to dominate over other classes.

You may remember what Engels said even of the peasants who employ hired labour: Most likely we shall not have to expropriate all of them.⁸⁵ We are expropriating as a general rule, and we have no kulaks in the Soviets. We are crushing them. We suppress them physically when they worm their way into the Soviets and from there try to choke the poor peasants. You see how the domination of one class is exercised here. Only the proletariat may dominate. But this is applied in one way to the small peasant, in another to the middle peasant, in another to the landowner, and in yet another to the petty bourgeois. The whole point is for us to understand this change of attitude brought about by international conditions, to understand that it is inevitable that slogans we were accustomed to during the past six months of the revolution's history should be modified as far as the petty-bourgeois democrats are concerned. We must say that we reserve the power for the same class. In relation to the petty-bourgeois democrats our slogan was one of agreement, but we were forced to resort to terror. If you co-operators and intellectuals really agree to live in good-neighbourly relations with us, then work a bit and do the jobs we give you. If you don't, you will be lawbreakers and our enemies, and we shall fight you. But if you maintain good-neighbourly relations and perform these tasks, that will be more than enough for us. Our support is secure. We've always known you were weak and flabby. But we don't deny we need you, for you are the only educated group.

Things would not be so bad if we did not have to build socialism with people inherited from capitalism. But that is the whole trouble with socialist construction—we have to build socialism with people who have been thoroughly spoiled by capitalism. That is the whole trouble with the transition—it is associated with a dictatorship which can

be exercised only by one class—the proletariat. That is why we say the proletariat will set the pace since it has been schooled and moulded into a fighting force capable of smashing the bourgeoisie. Between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat stand innumerable transitional groups, and our policy to them must now be put on the lines which were envisaged by our theory, and which we are now in a position to follow in practice. We shall have to settle a number of problems and make a number of agreements and technical assignments which we, as the ruling proletarian power, must know how to set. We must know how to set the middle peasant one assignment—to assist in commodity exchange and in exposing the kulak—and the co-operators another—they have the apparatus for distributing products on a mass scale, and we must take over that apparatus. And the intellectuals must be set quite a different assignment. They cannot continue their sabotage, and they are now in a very good-neighbourly mood towards us. We must make use of these intellectuals, set them definite tasks and keep an eye on them and check their work; we must treat them as Marx said when speaking of office workers under the Paris Commune: "Every other employer knows how to choose assistants and accountants for his business, and, if they for once make a mistake, to redress it promptly. If they prove to be unfit for the job, he replaces them with other, efficient assistants and accountants."⁸⁶

We are building our state out of the elements left over by capitalism. We cannot build it if we do not utilise such a heritage of capitalist culture as the intellectuals. Now we can afford to treat the petty bourgeoisie as good neighbours who are under the strict control of the state. The class-conscious proletariat's job now is to appreciate that its domination does not mean carrying out all the tasks itself. Whoever thinks that has not the slightest inkling of socialist construction and has learnt nothing from a year of revolution and dictatorship. People like that had better go to school and learn something. But whoever has learnt something in this period will say to himself: "These intellectuals are the people I am now going to use in construction. For I have a strong enough support among the peasants." And we must remember that we can only work out the form

of construction that will lead to socialism in that struggle, and in a number of agreements and trial agreements between the proletariat and the petty-bourgeois democrats.

Remember that Engels said we must act by force of example.⁸⁷ No form will be final until complete communism has been achieved. We never claimed to know the exact road. But we are inevitably moving towards communism. In times like these every week is worth more than decades of tranquility. The six months that have elapsed since the Brest-Litovsk Peace have shown a swing away from us. The West-European revolution—a revolution which is following our example—should strengthen us. We must take account of the changes taking place, we must take account of every element, and must have no illusions, for we know that the waverers will remain waverers until the world socialist revolution is completely triumphant. That may not be so soon, although the course of the German revolution leads us to hope that it may be sooner than many anticipate. The German revolution is developing in the same way as ours, but at a faster pace. In any case, our job now is to wage a desperate struggle against British and American imperialism. Just because it feels that Bolshevism has become a world force, it is trying to throttle us as fast as possible in the hope of dealing first with the Russian Bolsheviks, and then with its own.

We must make use of the waverers whom the atrocities of imperialism are driving towards us. And we shall do so. You know full well that in time of war no aid, even indirect, can be scorned. In war even the position of the wavering classes is of immense significance. The fiercer the war, the more we need to gain influence over the waverers who are coming over to us. So the tactics we have been pursuing for six months must be modified to suit the new tasks with regard to the various groups of petty-bourgeois democrats.

If I have succeeded in directing the attention of Party workers to this problem and in inducing them to seek a correct solution by systematic experiment, I may consider my task accomplished.

REPLY TO THE DISCUSSION OF REPORT
ON THE ATTITUDE OF THE PROLETARIAT
TO PETTY-BOURGEOIS DEMOCRATS

Comrades, I have a few remarks to make in reply to the discussion. First of all, I would like to reply to the question of dogma that was raised. Marx and Engels repeatedly said that our teaching is not a dogma, but a guide to action," and I think that is what we should bear in mind most.

The teaching of Marx and Engels is not a dogma to be learnt by heart. It must be taken as a guide to action. We have always stood by that, and I think we have acted consistently, never succumbing to opportunism, modifying our tactics. That is no departure from Marxism, and certainly cannot be called opportunism. I have said before, and I repeat once again, that this teaching is not a dogma, but a guide to action.

Now on to Comrade Steklov's remark about whom we are to make an agreement with—the top men or the rank and file? My reply is, of course, with the rank and file, and then with the top men; and when it comes to fighting the top men, all will depend on the particular circumstances. I shall come to that, but just now I see no practical possibility of an agreement with the Menshevik and S.R. parties. It is said that agreement means ceding something. What do we intend to cede and how are we going to depart from basic policy? That would be apostasy, but if it is to apply only to practice, there is nothing new in it. Of course, we shall never renounce our principles. That does not come into the argument now. Fifteen years ago there was a controversy over the basic policy and principles and, unfortunately, I had to carry on this controversy mostly abroad,

not in Russia. But now it is the question of state power that is at issue, and there simply cannot be any question of ceding anything here. No wonder Wilson declared: "Our enemy now is world Bolshevism." That is what the bourgeoisie all over the world are saying. The fact that they are preparing to attack us means they realise that the Bolshevik government is not only a Russian but a world phenomenon. He would be a sorry and miserable Bolshevik who offered any kind of agreement to the bourgeoisie. And, anyway, now that the fires of revolution have spread to so many countries, no capitalist bourgeois government will or can consent to it.

When the recent events developed, the Swiss bourgeoisie said outright: "We are not Russians, we shan't surrender power to you." Captain Sadoul, who has now sided with Bolshevism, writes that he is surprised at the astonishing docility of the Russian bourgeoisie, and declares that that is not the way the French bourgeoisie will act. There the struggle will be far fiercer, and civil war, if it breaks out, will assume the most ruthless forms. No one would deny it.

In practice, the matter has been fully decided by the year of proletarian dictatorship, and no peasant or worker would think of trying to reach agreement with the bourgeoisie. As to agreement being nothing new, I fully agree. I only wanted all of us to confer on these questions.

The circumstances which most repelled the Mensheviks and S.R.s and the lesser intellectuals from us, namely, the relentless struggle over the Brest-Litovsk Peace when German imperialism was on the advance, are now a thing of the past. But we know perfectly well that any success, however transient, the British and French may have, will produce more hesitation among these intellectuals and petty democrats, and they will begin to spread panic and desert to the other side. We are making an agreement with them to achieve definite results and for definite practical work. These tactics should present no cause either for controversy or surprise. Yet many, even such an influential member of the Moscow Soviet as Comrade Maximov, have shown they do not understand these tactics. Comrade Maximov said that we do not have to come to terms with Khinchuk, but only come to a sensible understanding with him. When we issued the first decree on the co-operative societies in the

spring, and they presented us with an ultimatum, we gave in to them. That is what we call agreement—there is no other name for this policy. And I shall be satisfied if every Soviet official makes it a rule and says to himself and all his comrades that we must come to a sensible understanding with the petty-bourgeois democrats.

In our work, especially in our work in the localities, we are still a long way from a sensible understanding. We all too frequently do not discuss matters sensibly. This is thrown in our faces by people who do not appreciate that this is bound to happen in building a new society. There is no genius who could build a new way of life without having learnt how to build. We are no good at coming to sensible terms with practical men when we have to. To run a shop, you must know *how* to run it. We need people who know their business. We Bolsheviks have had very little chance to apply our talents to practical affairs of this kind. We are not often short of propagandists, but our most crying shortage is the lack of efficient leaders and organisers. And that is still so despite the year's experience we have behind us. Come to a sensible understanding with every person who has enough experience in this sphere and who favours neutrality and good-neighbourly relations. If he knows how to run a shop and distribute goods, if he can teach us anything. if he is a practical man, he will be a great attribute.

Everybody knows the Bolsheviks have many enemies among their "friends" ever since their triumph. Very often utterly unreliable and dishonest people worm their way into our midst, elements that are politically unstable, who sell us out, deceive us and betray us. We are perfectly aware of it, but it does not alter our purpose. It is historically inevitable. When the Mensheviks reproach us that among Soviet employees there are many hangers-on, people who are dishonest even in the ordinary sense, we say: Where are we to get better people? What can we do to make the best people believe in us at once? No revolution can immediately triumph and convince everyone, can make people believe in it at once. A revolution may begin in one country, and elsewhere people will not believe in it. Our revolution is reckoned an awful nightmare, utter chaos, and in other countries they do not expect anything to come of our

organised "chaotic" assemblies, which we call Soviets. And that is quite natural. There were many things we had to fight for. So when they say we must come to a sensible understanding with Khinchuk, because he knows how to run shops, I say: Come to terms with others too, and make use of the petty bourgeoisie, they are good at many things.

If we drive this "come to an understanding" slogan into the heads of the people in the localities, if we realise that a new class is awakening to power, that things are being run by people who have never tackled such a complicated job before, and are naturally making mistakes, we shan't be sorry. We know that it is impossible to govern without making mistakes. But, besides making mistakes, people are using the power crudely, as nothing but power, as though to say: "I have the power, I have given my orders, and you must obey." We say, this is not the way to treat quite a number of people—the petty-bourgeois democrats in the trade unions, the peasants and those in the co-operatives—it is becoming unnecessary. It is therefore more sensible to come to an understanding with the petty-bourgeois democrats, especially the intellectuals—that is our task. Of course, we shall come to such an understanding on the basis of our policy, we shall do so as the government.

We ask: Is it true you have abandoned hostility for neutrality and good-neighbourly relations? Is it true you have stopped being hostile? If not, we shall not close our eyes to the fact and we'll tell you straight: If you want war, you'll have it. And we'll act as people do in war. If you really have abandoned your hostility for neutrality, however, if you really do want good-neighbourly relations—I have taken these words from statements by people who do not belong to the communist camp, who only yesterday were much closer to the whiteguards—I say that since there are so many people abandoning their former hostility for neutrality and good-neighbourly relations, we must continue our propaganda.

Comrade Khmelnitsky need have no fear that the Mensheviks are carrying on their own propaganda to run the lives of the workers. We won't mention the Social-Democrats, who have not understood the socialist republic, nor the petty-bourgeois bureaucrats. What we have to do is wage an

ideological struggle, a relentless war, against Menshevism. You cannot make a worse insult to a Menshevik than to call him a petty-bourgeois democrat; and the more calmly you try to prove it to him, the more furious he will get. It is a mistake to think we shall surrender a hundredth or even a thousandth part of the position we have won. We shan't budge an inch.

The examples quoted by Comrade Schmidt show that even the workers who stood closest to the bourgeoisie (like the printers, for example), the petty-bourgeois clerks, the bourgeois bank officials who used to perform the business operations in the commercial and industrial firms, stand to lose a lot from the transition to socialism. We have closed down a great many bourgeois papers, we have nationalised the banks, we have blocked several channels through which bank employees used to make money by dabbling in profiteering. Even in this camp we see them wavering, we find them siding with us. If Khinchuk is valuable because he knows how to run shops, the bank employee is valuable because he knows the ins and outs of the money business, with which many of us may have a theoretical acquaintance, but in which we are very weak practically. We must come to a sensible understanding with a man who knows the ins and outs of this business and who tells us he has abandoned his former hostility for neutrality and good-neighbourliness. I shall be more than satisfied if Comrade Maximov, as a prominent member of the Presidium of the Moscow Soviet, pursues in the Soviets the tactics he spoke of in relation to the intellectuals and the vacillating petty bourgeoisie.

Next, the question of the co-operative societies. Comrade Steklov said the co-operatives stink. Comrade Maximov said we should not pass decrees like the last one passed by the Council of People's Commissars. On the practical side opinions differed. It is nothing new to us that we must come to an agreement with the petty bourgeoisie on such a basis if they are not hostile to us. If the old stand is no good, it should be revised when new circumstances demand it. And things have certainly changed all right. The co-operatives are a striking example. The co-operative apparatus is a supply apparatus based on the mass participation of the working people themselves, instead of the private initiative

of capitalists. Kautsky was right when he said, long before he became a renegade, that socialist society is one big co-operative.

If we are out to get control going and organise the economy in a practical way, in the interests of hundreds of thousands of people, we must not forget that when socialists discuss this question they point out that directors of trusts, as experienced practical men, may be useful to them. Today experience shows that petty-bourgeois people have renounced hostility for neutrality. And, moreover, we must realise that they do know how to run shops. We do not deny that Khinchuk as an ideologist is chock-full of bourgeois prejudices. They all reek of them, but at the same time, they have practical knowledge. As far as ideas are concerned, all the guns are on our side, and not a single one on theirs. But when they say they are no longer hostile and intend to be neutral, we must remember that now hundreds and thousands of people less capable than Khinchuk are coming to a sensible understanding. We must know how to come to terms with them. In practical matters they know more than we do and are more proficient, and we must learn from them. Let them learn from us how to influence the international proletariat; but when it comes to running shops we shall learn from them. That is something we do not know. Technicians with special knowledge are needed in every field.

As far as the co-operatives are concerned, I don't understand why you say they stink. When drafting the first decree on the co-operatives we invited for discussion in the Council of People's Commissars people who not only were not Communists, but were actually far closer to the whiteguards. We conferred with them and asked: Can you accept this point? They replied: We can accept this, but not that. Of course, looking at it offhand, superficially, this was compromising with the bourgeoisie. For, after all, these were representatives of bourgeois co-operatives, and it was at their request that several clauses were deleted from the decree. Thus, we deleted a clause providing that there should be no dues or entrance fees in the proletarian co-operatives. To us that seemed quite acceptable, but they rejected our proposal.

We say we must come to terms with people who know how to run shops much better than we do; that's something we are weak at. But we shall not budge an inch from our struggle. When we issued another decree of the same type, Comrade Maximov said such decrees must not be written, because the decree says that the co-operatives that were closed down are to be reopened. This shows that in the Moscow Soviet, as among ourselves, there are certain misapprehensions, and if only for the sake of removing such misapprehensions, conferences and discussions should be arranged like ours here today.

We said that in the interests of our work we intended to utilise not only the trade unions in general, but even the Union of Trade and Industrial Employees, and, you know, the trade and industrial employees have always been a mainstay of the bourgeois system. But since these people have come to us and say they are willing to live on good-neighbourly terms with us, we must welcome them with open arms, and accept the hand they proffer—our own won't drop off. We do not forget that if the British and French imperialists were to strike tomorrow, they would be the first to turn tail and run away. But as long as this party, these bourgeois people do not run away, we repeat that we must have closer relations with them. That is why we adopted the decree published on Sunday, the one that is not to Comrade Maximov's liking—which shows that he clings to the old communist tactics, tactics which are inapplicable to the new conditions. We drew up that decree the other day, and received in reply the resolution of the Central Committee of the Employees,¹⁹ and it would be foolish to say we are issuing decrees at the wrong time, when the change of front has begun and the situation is changing.

The armed capitalists are continuing the war with greater stubbornness than ever, and it is immensely important for our practical construction to take advantage of this change of attitude, even if it is only temporary. All power is in our hands. We need not close down co-operatives, and we can reopen those that have been closed down, for we closed them down when they served the ends of whiteguard propaganda. Every slogan has the faculty of becoming more rigid than is necessary. When the wave of closing down and

persecuting the co-operatives swept over Russia, it was the conditions of the time that made it necessary. But now it is no longer necessary. They are a highly important apparatus connected with the middle peasants; they unite the scattered and disunited sections of the peasants. These Khinchuks are doing a useful job, which was started by bourgeois elements. When these peasants and petty-bourgeois democrats say they are abandoning hostility for neutrality, for good-neighbourly relations, we must say to them: That's just what we want. And now, good neighbours, let us come to a sensible understanding. We shall assist you all we can and help you to exercise your rights, and we shall examine your claims and grant you every privilege, but you must carry out the jobs we assign you. If you don't, remember that the whole Extraordinary Commission apparatus is in our hands. If you are unable to make proper use of your rights and do not carry out our assignments, we have the whole apparatus of State Control in our hands, and we shall regard you as violators of the will of the state. You must account for the last kopek, and any violation will be punished as a violation of the will of the state and its laws.

This entire system of control remains in our hands, but just now the task of winning over these people, if only for a while, although it may not be a gigantic one from the standpoint of world politics, is for us one of urgent necessity. It will strengthen our position in the war. We have no decently organised rear. It will give us a moral victory, for it will show the West-European imperialists that they can expect to meet pretty serious resistance. And that is not to be scoffed at, for inside every country there is a workers' opposition to the attack on Russia. That is why I think, as far as one can judge from Comrade Maximov's statement, that we are groping our way to a definite agreement. Even if differences do crop up, they are not so important, for once we recognise the necessity of coming to a sensible understanding with all the petty-bourgeois democrats, with the intellectuals, the co-operators and the trade unions which still do not recognise us, while at the same time never allowing power to slip from our hands—if we firmly adhere to this policy all winter, we shall gain a great advantage for the whole cause of world revolution.

TELEGRAM TO COMMANDER-IN-CHIEF
In Serpukhov

29/11

As our troops push on westwards and into the Ukraine, provisional regional Soviet governments are being formed to back up the Soviets in the localities. This has the advantage of depriving the Ukrainian, Lithuanian, Latvian and Estonian chauvinists of a chance to regard our troop movements as occupation and of creating a favourable situation for further advance. Otherwise our troops would have been in an impossible situation on occupied territory and the local population would not have met them as liberators. In view of the situation, please issue an order to the commanders of the corresponding units so that they render all possible support to the provisional Soviet governments in Latvia, Estonia, the Ukraine and Lithuania, but, of course, only to the Soviet governments.

Lenin

Written November 29, 1918


1

Published according to
the text written by
Stalin with additions by Lenin

THE PROLETARIAN REVOLUTION
AND
THE RENEGADE KAUTSKY ^{**}

Written October-November 1918
Published in pamphlet form in 1918
by Komintern Publishers, Moscow

Published according to the
pamphlet checked with
the manuscript



Cover of the pamphlet *The Proletarian Revolution and the
Renegade Kautsky*. 1918
Reduced

PREFACE

Kautsky's pamphlet, *The Dictatorship of the Proletariat*, recently published in Vienna (Wien, 1918, Ignaz Brand, pp. 63) is a most lucid example of that utter and ignominious bankruptcy of the Second International about which all honest socialists in all countries have been talking for a long time. The proletarian revolution is now becoming a practical issue in a number of countries, and an examination of Kautsky's renegade sophistries and his complete renunciation of Marxism is therefore essential.

First of all, it should be emphasised, however, that the present author has, from the very beginning of the war, repeatedly pointed to Kautsky's rupture with Marxism. A number of articles published between 1914 and 1916 in *Sotsial-Demokrat*⁹¹ and *Kommunist*,⁹² issued abroad, dealt with this subject. These articles were afterwards collected and published by the Petrograd Soviet under the title *Against the Stream*, by G. Zinoviev and N. Lenin (Petrograd, 1918, pp. 550). In a pamphlet published in Geneva in 1915 and translated at the same time into German and French⁹³ I wrote about "Kautskyism" as follows:

"Kautsky, the leading authority in the Second International, is a most typical and striking example of how a verbal recognition of Marxism has led in practice to its conversion into 'Struvism' or into 'Brentanoism' [i.e., into a bourgeois-liberal theory recognising the non-revolutionary "class" struggle of the proletariat, which was expressed most clearly by Struve, the Russian writer, and Brentano, the German economist]. Another example is Plekhanov. By means of patent sophistry, Marxism is stripped of its revolutionary living spirit; *everything* is recognised in

Marxism *except* the revolutionary methods of struggle, the propaganda and preparation of those methods, and the education of the masses in this direction. Kautsky 'reconciles' in an unprincipled way the fundamental idea of social-chauvinism, recognition of defence of the fatherland in the present war, with a diplomatic sham concession to the Lefts—his abstention from voting for war credits, his verbal claim to be in the opposition, etc. Kautsky, who in 1909 wrote a book on the approaching epoch of revolutions and on the connection between war and revolution, Kautsky, who in 1912 signed the Basle Manifesto⁹⁴ on taking revolutionary advantage of the impending war, is outdoing himself in justifying and embellishing social-chauvinism and, like Plekhanov, joins the bourgeoisie in ridiculing any thought of revolution and all steps towards the immediate revolutionary struggle.

"The working class cannot play its world-revolutionary role unless it wages a ruthless struggle against this back-sliding, spinelessness, subservience to opportunism, and unparalleled vulgarisation of the theories of Marxism. Kautskyism is not fortuitous; it is the social product of the contradictions within the Second International, a blend of loyalty to Marxism in word and subordination to opportunism in deed" (G. Zinoviev and N. Lenin, *Socialism and War*, Geneva, 1915, pp. 13-14).

Again, in my book *Imperialism, the Latest Stage of Capitalism*,⁹⁵ written in 1916 and published in Petrograd in 1917, I examined in detail the theoretical fallacy of all Kautsky's arguments about imperialism. I quoted Kautsky's definition of imperialism: "Imperialism is a product of highly developed industrial capitalism. It consists in the striving of every industrial capitalist nation to bring under its control or to annex all large areas of *agrarian* [Kautsky's italics] territory, irrespective of what nations inhabit it." I showed how utterly incorrect this definition was, and how it was "adapted" to the glossing over of the most profound contradictions of imperialism, and then to reconciliation with opportunism. I gave my own definition of imperialism: "Imperialism is capitalism at that stage of development at which the dominance of monopolies and finance capital is established; at which the export of capital has acquired

pronounced importance; at which the division of the world among the international trusts has begun; at which the division of all territories of the globe among the biggest capitalist powers has been completed." I showed that Kautsky's critique of imperialism is on an even lower plane than the bourgeois, philistine critique.

Finally, in August and September 1917—that is, before the proletarian revolution in Russia (October 25 [November 7], 1917), I wrote a pamphlet (published in Petrograd at the beginning of 1918) entitled *The State and Revolution. The Marxist Theory of the State and the Tasks of the Proletariat in the Revolution*. In Chapter VI of this book, entitled "The Vulgarisation of Marxism by the Opportunists", I devoted special attention to Kautsky, showing that he had completely distorted Marx's ideas, tailoring them to suit opportunism, and that he had "repudiated the revolution in deeds, while accepting it in words".

In substance, the chief theoretical mistake Kautsky makes in his pamphlet on the dictatorship of the proletariat lies in those opportunist distortions of Marx's ideas on the state—the distortions which I exposed in detail in my pamphlet, *The State and Revolution*.

These preliminary remarks were necessary for they show that I openly accused Kautsky of being a renegade *long before* the Bolsheviks assumed state power and were condemned by him on that account.

HOW KAUTSKY TURNED MARX INTO A COMMON LIBERAL

The fundamental question that Kautsky discusses in his pamphlet is that of the very essence of proletarian revolution, namely, the dictatorship of the proletariat. This is a question that is of the greatest importance for all countries, especially for the advanced ones, especially for those at war, and especially at the present time. One may say without fear of exaggeration that this is the key problem of the entire proletarian class struggle. It is, therefore, necessary to pay particular attention to it.

Kautsky formulates the question as follows: "The contrast between the two socialist trends" (i.e., the Bolsheviks

and non-Bolsheviks) "is the contrast between two radically different methods: the *dictatorial* and the *democratic*" (p. 3).

Let us point out, in passing, that when calling the non-Bolsheviks in Russia, i.e., the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries, socialists, Kautsky was guided by their *name*, that is, by a word, and not by the *actual place* they occupy in the struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. What a wonderful understanding and application of Marxism! But more of this later.

For the moment we must deal with the main point, namely, with Kautsky's great discovery of the "fundamental contrast" between "democratic and dictatorial methods". That is the crux of the matter; that is the essence of Kautsky's pamphlet. And that is such an awful theoretical muddle, such a complete renunciation of Marxism, that Kautsky, it must be confessed, has far excelled Bernstein.

The question of the dictatorship of the proletariat is a question of the relation of the proletarian state to the bourgeois state, of proletarian democracy to bourgeois democracy. One would think that this is as plain as a pike-staff. But Kautsky, like a schoolmaster who has become as dry as dust from quoting the same old textbooks on history, persistently turns his back on the twentieth century and his face to the eighteenth century, and for the hundredth time, in a number of paragraphs, in an incredibly tedious fashion chews the old cud over the relation of bourgeois democracy to absolutism and medievalism!

It sounds just like he were chewing rags in his sleep!

But this means he utterly fails to understand what is what! One cannot help smiling at Kautsky's effort to make it appear that there are people who preach "contempt for democracy" (p. 11) and so forth. That is the sort of twaddle Kautsky uses to befog and confuse the issue, for he talks like the liberals, speaking of democracy in general, and not of *bourgeois* democracy; he even avoids using this precise, class term, and, instead, tries to speak about "pre-socialist" democracy. This windbag devotes almost one-third of his pamphlet, twenty pages out of sixty-three, to this twaddle, which is so agreeable to the bourgeoisie, for it is tantamount to embellishing bourgeois democracy, and obscures the question of the proletarian revolution.

But, after all, the title of Kautsky's pamphlet is *The Dictatorship of the Proletariat*. Everybody knows that this is the very essence of Marx's doctrine; and after a lot of irrelevant twaddle Kautsky *was obliged* to quote Marx's words on the dictatorship of the proletariat.

But the *way* in which he the "Marxist" did it was simply farcical! Listen to this:

"This view" (which Kautsky dubs "contempt for democracy") "rests upon a single word of Karl Marx's." This is what Kautsky literally says on page 20. And on page 60 the same thing is repeated even in the form that they (the Bolsheviks) "opportunely recalled the little word" (that is literally what he says—*des Wörtchens!!*) "about the dictatorship of the proletariat which Marx once used in 1875 in a letter".

Here is Marx's "little word":

"Between capitalist and communist society lies the period of the revolutionary transformation of the one into the other. Corresponding to this is also a political transition period in which the state can be nothing but the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat."⁹⁸

First of all, to call this classical reasoning of Marx's, which sums up the whole of his revolutionary teaching, "a single word" and even "a little word", is an insult to and complete renunciation of Marxism. It must not be forgotten that Kautsky knows Marx almost by heart, and, judging by all he has written, he has in his desk, or in his head, a number of pigeon-holes in which all that was ever written by Marx is most carefully filed so as to be ready at hand for quotation. Kautsky *must know* that both Marx and Engels, in their letters as well as in their published works, *repeatedly* spoke about the dictatorship of the proletariat, before and especially after the Paris Commune. Kautsky must know that the formula "dictatorship of the proletariat" is merely a more historically concrete and scientifically exact formulation of the proletariat's task of "smashing" the bourgeois state machine, about which both Marx and Engels, in summing up the experience of the Revolution of 1848, and, still more so, of 1871, spoke *for forty years*, between 1852 and 1891.

How is this monstrous distortion of Marxism by that Marxist pedant Kautsky to be explained? As far as the philo-

sophical roots of this phenomenon are concerned, it amounts to the substitution of eclecticism and sophistry for dialectics. Kautsky is a past master at this sort of substitution. Regarded from the point of view of practical politics, it amounts to subservience to the opportunists, that is, in the last analysis to the bourgeoisie. Since the outbreak of the war, Kautsky has made increasingly rapid progress in this art of being a Marxist in words and a lackey of the bourgeoisie in deeds, until he has become a virtuoso at it.

One feels even more convinced of this when examining the remarkable way in which Kautsky "interprets" Marx's "little word" about the dictatorship of the proletariat. Listen to this:

"Marx, unfortunately, neglected to show us in greater detail how he conceived this dictatorship...." (This is an utterly mendacious phrase of a renegade, for Marx and Engels gave us, indeed, quite a number of most detailed indications, which Kautsky, the Marxist pedant, has deliberately ignored.) "Literally, the word dictatorship means the abolition of democracy. But, of course, taken literally, this word also means the undivided rule of a single person unrestricted by any laws—an autocracy, which differs from despotism only insofar as it is not meant as a permanent state institution, but as a transient emergency measure.

"The term, 'dictatorship of the proletariat', hence not the dictatorship of a single individual, but of a class, *ipso facto* precludes the possibility that Marx in this connection had in mind a dictatorship in the literal sense of the term.

"He speaks here not of a *form of government*, but of a *condition*, which must necessarily arise wherever the proletariat has gained political power. That Marx in this case did not have in mind a form of government is proved by the fact that he was of the opinion that in Britain and America the transition might take place peacefully, i.e., in a democratic way" (p. 20).

We have deliberately quoted this argument in full so that the reader may clearly see the methods Kautsky the "theoretician" employs.

Kautsky chose to approach the question in such a way as to begin with a definition of the "word" dictatorship.

Very well. Everyone has a sacred right to approach a question in whatever way he pleases. One must only distinguish a serious and honest approach from a dishonest one. Anyone who wants to be serious in approaching the

question in this way ought to give *his own definition* of the "word". Then the question would be put fairly and squarely. But Kautsky does not do that. "Literally," he writes, "the word dictatorship means the abolition of democracy."

In the first place, this is not a definition. If Kautsky wanted to avoid giving a definition of the concept dictatorship, why did he choose this particular approach to the question?

Secondly, it is obviously wrong. It is natural for a liberal to speak of "democracy" in general; but a Marxist will never forget to ask: "for what class?" Everyone knows, for instance (and Kautsky the "historian" knows it too), that rebellions, or even strong ferment, among the slaves in ancient times at once revealed the fact that the ancient state was essentially a *dictatorship of the slaveowners*. Did this dictatorship abolish democracy *among*, and *for*, the slaveowners? Everybody knows that it did not.

Kautsky the "Marxist" made this monstrously absurd and untrue statement because he "*forgot*" the class struggle....

To transform Kautsky's liberal and false assertion into a Marxist and true one, one must say: dictatorship does not necessarily mean the abolition of democracy for the class that exercises the dictatorship over other classes; but it does mean the abolition (or very material restriction, which is also a form of abolition) of democracy for the class over which, or against which, the dictatorship is exercised.

But, however true this assertion may be, it does not give a definition of dictatorship.

Let us examine Kautsky's next sentence:

"...But, of course, taken literally, this word also means the undivided rule of a single person unrestricted by any laws...."

Like a blind puppy sniffing at random first in one direction and then in another, Kautsky accidentally stumbled upon *one* true idea (namely, that dictatorship is rule unrestricted by any laws), *nevertheless*, he *failed* to give a definition of dictatorship, and, moreover, he made an obvious historical blunder, namely, that dictatorship means the rule of a single person. This is even grammatically incorrect, since dictatorship may also be exercised by a handful of persons, or by an oligarchy, or by a class, etc.

Kautsky then goes on to point out the difference between dictatorship and despotism, but, although what he says is obviously incorrect, we shall not dwell upon it, as it is wholly irrelevant to the question that interests us. Everyone knows Kautsky's inclination to turn from the twentieth century to the eighteenth, and from the eighteenth century to classical antiquity, and we hope that the German proletariat, after it has attained its dictatorship, will bear this inclination of his in mind and appoint him, say, teacher of ancient history at some Gymnasium. To try to evade a definition of the dictatorship of the proletariat by philosophising about despotism is either crass stupidity or very clumsy trickery.

As a result, we find that, having undertaken to discuss the dictatorship, Kautsky rattled off a great deal of manifest lies, but has given no definition! Yet, instead of relying on his mental faculties he could have used his memory to extract from "pigeon-holes" all those instances in which Marx speaks of dictatorship. Had he done so, he would certainly have arrived either at the following definition or at one in substance coinciding with it:

Dictatorship is rule based directly upon force and unrestricted by any laws.

The revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat is rule won and maintained by the use of violence by the proletariat against the bourgeoisie, rule that is unrestricted by any laws.

This simple truth, a truth that is as plain as a pikestaff to every class-conscious worker (who represents the people, and not an upper section of petty-bourgeois scoundrels who have been bribed by the capitalists, such as are the social-imperialists of all countries), this truth, which is obvious to every representative of the exploited classes fighting for their emancipation, this truth, which is beyond dispute for every Marxist, has to be "extracted by force" from the most learned Mr. Kautsky! How is it to be explained? Simply by that spirit of servility with which the leaders of the Second International, who have become contemptible sycophants in the service of the bourgeoisie, are imbued.

Kautsky first committed a sleight of hand by proclaiming the obvious nonsense that the word dictatorship, in its

literal sense, means the dictatorship of a single person, and then—on the strength of this sleight of hand—he declared that “hence” Marx’s words about the dictatorship of a class were *not* meant in the literal sense (but in one in which dictatorship does not imply revolutionary violence, but the “peaceful” winning of a majority under bourgeois—mark you—“democracy”).

One must, if you please, distinguish between a “condition” and a “form of government”. A wonderfully profound distinction; it is like drawing a distinction between the “condition” of stupidity of a man who reasons foolishly and the “form” of his stupidity.

Kautsky *finds it necessary* to interpret dictatorship as a “condition of domination” (this is the literal expression he uses on the very next page, p. 21), because then *revolutionary violence, and violent revolution, disappear*. The “condition of domination” is a condition in which any majority finds itself under ... “democracy”! Thanks to such a fraud, *revolution* happily *disappears*!

The fraud, however, is too crude and will not save Kautsky. One cannot hide the fact that dictatorship presupposes and implies a “condition”, one so disagreeable to renegades, of *revolutionary violence* of one class against another. It is patently absurd to draw a distinction between a “condition” and a “form of government”. To speak of forms of government in this connection is trebly stupid, for every schoolboy knows that monarchy and republic are two different forms of government. It must be explained to Mr. Kautsky that *both* these forms of government, like all transitional “forms of government” under capitalism, are only variations of the *bourgeois state*, that is, of the *dictatorship of the bourgeoisie*.

Lastly, to speak of forms of government is not only a stupid, but also a very crude falsification of Marx, who was very clearly speaking here of this or that form or type of *state*, and not of forms of government.

The proletarian revolution is impossible without the forcible destruction of the bourgeois state machine and the substitution for it of a *new one* which, in the words of Engels, is “no longer a state in the proper sense of the word”.⁹⁷

Because of his renegade position, Kautsky, however, has to befog and belie all this.

Look what wretched subterfuges he uses.

First subterfuge. "That Marx in this case did not have in mind a form of government is proved by the fact that he was of the opinion that in Britain and America the transition might take place peacefully, i.e., in a democratic way."

The *form of government* has absolutely nothing to do with it, for there are monarchies which are not typical of the bourgeois *state*, such, for instance, as have no military clique, and there are republics which are quite typical in this respect, such, for instance, as have a military clique and a bureaucracy. This is a universally known historical and political fact, and Kautsky cannot falsify it.

If Kautsky had wanted to argue in a serious and honest manner he would have asked himself: Are there historical laws relating to revolution which know of no exception? And the reply would have been: No, there are no such laws. Such laws only apply to the typical, to what Marx once termed the "ideal", meaning average, normal, typical capitalism.

Further, was there in the seventies anything which made England and America exceptional *in regard to what we are now discussing*? It will be obvious to anyone at all familiar with the requirements of science in regard to the problems of history that this question must be put. To fail to put it is tantamount to falsifying science, to engaging in sophistry. And, the question having been put, there can be no doubt as to the reply: the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat is *violence* against the bourgeoisie; and the necessity of such violence is *particularly* called for, as Marx and Engels have repeatedly explained in detail (especially in *The Civil War in France* and in the preface to it), by the existence of *militarism and a bureaucracy*. But it is precisely these institutions that were *non-existent* in Britain and America in the seventies, when Marx made his observations (they *do* exist in Britain and in America *now*!).

Kautsky has to resort to trickery literally at every step to cover up his apostasy!

And note how he inadvertently betrayed his cloven hoof when he wrote: "peacefully, i.e., in a democratic way"!

In defining dictatorship, Kautsky tried his utmost to

conceal from the reader the fundamental feature of this concept, namely, revolutionary *violence*. But now the truth is out: it is a question of the contrast between *peaceful* and *violent revolutions*.

That is the crux of the matter. Kautsky has to resort to all these subterfuges, sophistries and falsifications only to excuse himself from *violent revolution*, and to conceal his renunciation of it, his desertion to the side of the *liberal* labour policy, i.e., to the side of the bourgeoisie. That is the crux of the matter.

Kautsky the "historian" so shamelessly falsifies history that he "forgets" the fundamental fact that pre-monopoly capitalism--which actually reached its zenith in the seventies--was by virtue of its fundamental *economic* traits, which found most typical expression in Britain and in America, distinguished by a, relatively speaking, maximum fondness for peace and freedom. Imperialism, on the other hand, i.e., monopoly capitalism, which finally matured only in the twentieth century, is, by virtue of its fundamental *economic* traits, distinguished by a minimum fondness for peace and freedom, and by a maximum and universal development of militarism. To "fail to notice" this in discussing the extent to which a peaceful or violent revolution is typical or probable is to stoop to the level of a most ordinary lackey of the bourgeoisie.

Second subterfuge. The Paris Commune was a dictatorship of the proletariat, but it was elected by *universal* suffrage, i.e., without depriving the bourgeoisie of the franchise, i.e., "democratically". And Kautsky says triumphantly: "... The dictatorship of the proletariat was for Marx" (or: according to Marx) "a condition which necessarily follows from pure democracy, if the proletariat forms the majority" (*bei überwiegendem Proletariat*, S. 21).

This argument of Kautsky's is so amusing that one truly suffers from a veritable *embarras de richesses* (an embarrassment due to the wealth ... of objections that can be made to it). Firstly, it is well known that the flower, the General Staff, the upper sections of the bourgeoisie, had fled from Paris to Versailles. In Versailles there was the "socialist" Louis Blanc—which, by the way, proves the falsity of Kautsky's assertion that "all trends" of socialism took part

in the Paris Commune. Is it not ridiculous to represent the division of the inhabitants of Paris into two belligerent camps, one of which embraced the entire militant and politically active section of the bourgeoisie, as "pure democracy" with "universal suffrage"?

Secondly, the Paris Commune waged war against Versailles as the workers' government of *France* against the bourgeois government. What have "pure democracy" and "universal suffrage" to do with it, when Paris was deciding the fate of France? When Marx expressed the opinion that the Paris Commune had committed a mistake in failing to seize the bank, which belonged to the whole of France,⁹⁸ did he not proceed from the principles and practice of "pure democracy"?

In actual fact, it is obvious that Kautsky is writing in a country where the police forbid people to laugh "in crowds", otherwise Kautsky would have been killed by ridicule.

Thirdly, I would respectfully remind Mr. Kautsky, who has Marx and Engels off pat, of the following appraisal of the Paris Commune given by Engels from the point of view of ... "pure democracy":

"Have these gentlemen" (the anti-authoritarians) "ever seen a revolution? A revolution is certainly the most authoritarian thing there is; it is an act whereby one part of the population imposes its will upon the other by means of rifles, bayonets and cannon—all of which are highly authoritarian means. And the victorious party must maintain its rule by means of the terror which its arms inspire in the reactionaries. Would the Paris Commune have lasted more than a day if it had not used the authority of the armed people against the bourgeoisie? Cannot we, on the contrary, blame it for having made too little use of that authority?"⁹⁹

Here is your "pure democracy"! How Engels would have ridiculed the vulgar petty bourgeois, the "Social-Democrat" (in the French sense of the forties and the general European sense of 1914-18), who took it into his head to talk about "pure democracy" in a class-divided society!

But that's enough. It is impossible to enumerate all Kautsky's various absurdities, since every phrase he utters is a bottomless pit of apostasy.

Marx and Engels analysed the Paris Commune in a most detailed manner and showed that its merit lay in its attempt to smash, to break up the "ready-made state machinery". Marx and Engels considered this conclusion to be so important that this was the only amendment they introduced in 1872 into the "obsolete" (in parts) programme of the *Communist Manifesto*.¹⁰⁰ Marx and Engels showed that the Paris Commune had abolished the army and the bureaucracy, had abolished *parliamentarism*, had destroyed "that parasitic excrescence, the state", etc. But the sage Kautsky, donning his nightcap, repeats the fairy-tale about "pure democracy", which has been told a thousand times by liberal professors.

No wonder Rosa Luxemburg declared, on August 4, 1914, that German Social-Democracy was a *stinking corpse*.

Third subterfuge. "When we speak of the dictatorship as a form of government we cannot speak of the dictatorship of a class, since a class, as we have already pointed out, can only rule but not govern...." It is "organisations" or "parties" that govern.

That is a muddle, a disgusting muddle, Mr. "Muddle-headed Counsellor"! Dictatorship is not a "form of government"; that is ridiculous nonsense. And Marx does not speak of the "form of government" but of the form or type of *state*. That is something altogether different, entirely different. It is altogether wrong, too, to say that a *class* cannot govern: such an absurdity could only have been uttered by a "parliamentary cretin", who sees nothing but bourgeois parliaments and notices nothing but "ruling parties". Any European country will provide Kautsky with examples of government by a ruling *class*, for instance, by the landowners in the Middle Ages, in spite of their insufficient organisation.

To sum up: Kautsky has in a most unparalleled manner distorted the concept dictatorship of the proletariat, and has turned Marx into a common liberal; that is, he himself has sunk to the level of a liberal who utters banal phrases about "pure democracy", embellishing and glossing over the class content of bourgeois democracy, and shrinking, above all, from the use of *revolutionary violence* by the oppressed class. By so "interpreting" the concept "revolutionary dic-

tatorship of the proletariat" as to expunge the revolutionary violence of the oppressed class against its oppressors, Kautsky has beaten the world record in the liberal distortion of Marx. The renegade Bernstein has proved to be a mere puppy compared with the renegade Kautsky.

BOURGEOIS AND PROLETARIAN DEMOCRACY

The question which Kautsky has so shamelessly muddled really stands as follows.

If we are not to mock at common sense and history, it is obvious that we cannot speak of "pure democracy" as long as different *classes* exist; we can only speak of *class* democracy. (Let us say in parenthesis that "pure democracy" is not only an *ignorant* phrase, revealing a lack of understanding both of the class struggle and of the nature of the state, but also a thrice-empty phrase, since in communist society democracy will *wither away* in the process of changing and becoming a habit, but will never be "pure" democracy.)

"Pure democracy" is the mendacious phrase of a liberal who wants to fool the workers. History knows of bourgeois democracy which takes the place of feudalism, and of proletarian democracy which takes the place of bourgeois democracy.

When Kautsky devotes dozens of pages to "proving" the truth that bourgeois democracy is progressive compared with medievalism, and that the proletariat must unfailingly utilise it in its struggle against the bourgeoisie, that in fact is just liberal twaddle intended to fool the workers. This is a truism, not only for educated Germany, but also for uneducated Russia. Kautsky is simply throwing "learned" dust in the eyes of the workers when, with a pompous mien, he talks about Weitling and the Jesuits of Paraguay and many other things, *in order to avoid telling about the bourgeois essence of modern, i.e., capitalist, democracy.*

Kautsky takes from Marxism what is acceptable to the liberals, to the bourgeoisie (the criticism of the Middle Ages, and the progressive historical role of capitalism in general and of capitalist democracy in particular), and discards, passes over in silence, glosses over all that in Marxism which is *unacceptable* to the bourgeoisie (the revo-

lutionary violence of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie for the latter's destruction). That is why Kautsky, by virtue of his objective position and irrespective of what his subjective convictions may be, inevitably proves to be a lackey of the bourgeoisie.

Bourgeois democracy, although a great historical advance in comparison with medievalism, always remains, and under capitalism is bound to remain, restricted, truncated, false and hypocritical, a paradise for the rich and a snare and deception for the exploited, for the poor. It is this truth, which forms a most essential part of Marx's teaching, that Kautsky the "Marxist" has failed to understand. On this—the fundamental issue—Kautsky offers "delights" for the bourgeoisie instead of a scientific criticism of those conditions which make every bourgeois democracy a democracy for the rich.

Let us first remind the most learned Mr. Kautsky of the theoretical propositions of Marx and Engels which that pedant has so disgracefully "forgotten" (to please the bourgeoisie), and then explain the matter as popularly as possible.

Not only the ancient and feudal, but also "the modern representative state is an instrument of exploitation of wage-labour by capital" (Engels, in his work on the state).¹⁰¹ "As, therefore, the state is only a transitional institution which is used in the struggle, in the revolution, to hold down one's adversaries by force, it is sheer nonsense to talk of a 'free people's state'; so long as the proletariat still needs the state, it does not need it in the interests of freedom but in order to hold down its adversaries, and as soon as it becomes possible to speak of freedom the state as such ceases to exist" (Engels, in his letter to Bebel, March 28, 1875). "In reality, however, the state is nothing but a machine for the oppression of one class by another, and indeed in the democratic republic no less than in the monarchy" (Engels, Introduction to *The Civil War in France* by Marx).¹⁰² Universal suffrage is "the gauge of the maturity of the working class. *It cannot and never will be anything more in the present-day state*". (Engels, in his work on the state).¹⁰³ Mr. Kautsky very tediously chews over the cud in the first part of this proposition, which is acceptable to the bour-

geoisie. But the second part, which we have italicised and which is not acceptable to the bourgeoisie, the renegade Kautsky passes over in silence!) "The Commune was to be a working, not a parliamentary, body, executive and legislative at the same time.... Instead of deciding once in three or six years which member of the ruling class was to represent and suppress (*ver- und zertreten*) the people in Parliament, universal suffrage was to serve the people, constituted in Communes, as individual suffrage serves every other employer in the search for workers, foremen and accountants for his business" (Marx, in his work on the Paris Commune, *The Civil War in France*).¹⁰⁴

Every one of these propositions, which are excellently known to the most learned Mr. Kautsky, is a slap in his face and lays bare his apostasy. Nowhere in his pamphlet does Kautsky reveal the slightest understanding of these truths. His whole pamphlet is a sheer mockery of Marxism!

Take the fundamental laws of modern states, take their administration, take freedom of assembly, freedom of the press, or "equality of all citizens before the law", and you will see at every turn evidence of the hypocrisy of bourgeois democracy with which every honest and class-conscious worker is familiar. There is not a single state, however democratic, which has no loopholes or reservations in its constitution guaranteeing the bourgeoisie the possibility of dispatching troops against the workers, of proclaiming martial law, and so forth, in case of a "violation of public order", and actually in case the exploited class "violates" its position of slavery and tries to behave in a non-slavish manner. Kautsky shamelessly embellishes bourgeois democracy and omits to mention, for instance, how the most democratic and republican bourgeoisie in America or Switzerland deal with workers on strike.

The wise and learned Kautsky keeps silent about these things! That learned politician does not realise that to remain silent on this matter is despicable. He prefers to tell the workers nursery tales of the kind that democracy means "protecting the minority". It is incredible, but it is a fact! In the year of our Lord 1918, in the fifth year of the world imperialist slaughter and the strangulation of internationalist minorities (i.e., those who have not despicably

betrayed socialism, like the Renaudels and Longuets, the Scheidemanns and Kautskys, the Hendersons and Webbs et al.) in all "democracies" of the world, the learned Mr. Kautsky sweetly, very sweetly, sings the praises of "protection of the minority". Those who are interested may read this on page 15 of Kautsky's pamphlet. And on page 16 this learned ... individual tells you about the Whigs and Tories in England in the eighteenth century!

What wonderful erudition! What refined servility to the bourgeoisie! What civilised belly-crawling before the capitalists and boot-licking! If I were Krupp or Scheidemann, or Clemenceau or Renaudel, I would pay Mr. Kautsky millions, reward him with Judas kisses, praise him before the workers and urge "socialist unity" with "honourable" men like him. To write pamphlets against the dictatorship of the proletariat, to talk about the Whigs and Tories in England in the eighteenth century, to assert that democracy means "protecting the minority", and remain silent about pogroms against internationalists in the "democratic" republic of America—isn't this rendering lackey service to the bourgeoisie?

The learned Mr. Kautsky has "forgotten"—accidentally forgotten, probably—a "trifle", namely, that the ruling party in a bourgeois democracy extends the protection of the minority only to another bourgeois party, while the proletariat, on all *serious, profound and fundamental* issues, gets martial law or pogroms, instead of the "protection of the minority". *The more highly developed a democracy is, the more imminent are pogroms or civil war in connection with any profound political divergence which is dangerous to the bourgeoisie.* The learned Mr. Kautsky could have studied this "law" of bourgeois democracy in connection with the Dreyfus case¹⁰⁵ in republican France, with the lynching of Negroes and internationalists in the democratic republic of America, with the case of Ireland and Ulster in democratic Britain,¹⁰⁶ with the baiting of the Bolsheviks and the staging of pogroms against them in April 1917 in the democratic republic of Russia. I have purposely chosen examples not only from wartime but also from pre-war time, peacetime. But mealy-mouthed Mr. Kautsky prefers to shut his eyes to these facts of the twentieth century, and instead

to tell the workers wonderfully new, remarkably interesting, unusually edifying and incredibly important things about the Whigs and Tories of the eighteenth century!

Take the bourgeois parliament. Can it be that the learned Kautsky has never heard that the *more highly* democracy is developed, the *more* the bourgeois parliaments are subjected by the stock exchange and the bankers? This does not mean that we must not make use of bourgeois parliament (the Bolsheviks made better use of it than probably any other party in the world, for in 1912-14 we won the entire workers' curia in the Fourth Duma). But it does mean that only a liberal can forget the *historical limitations and conventional nature* of the bourgeois parliamentary system as Kautsky does. Even in the most democratic bourgeois state the oppressed people at every step encounter the crying contradiction between the *formal* equality proclaimed by the "democracy" of the capitalists and the thousands of *real* limitations and subterfuges which turn the proletarians into *wage-slaves*. It is precisely this contradiction that is opening the eyes of the people to the rottenness, mendacity and hypocrisy of capitalism. It is this contradiction that the agitators and propagandists of socialism are constantly exposing to the people, *in order to prepare* them for revolution! And now that the era of revolution *has begun*, Kautsky turns his back upon it and begins to extol the charms of *moribund* bourgeois democracy.

Proletarian democracy, of which Soviet government is one of the forms, has brought a development and expansion of democracy unprecedented in the world, for the vast majority of the population, for the exploited and working people. To write a whole pamphlet about democracy, as Kautsky did, in which two pages are devoted to dictatorship and dozens to "pure democracy", and *fail to notice* this fact, means completely distorting the subject in liberal fashion.

Take foreign policy. In no bourgeois state, not even in the most democratic, is it conducted openly. The people are deceived everywhere, and in democratic France, Switzerland, America and Britain this is done on an incomparably wider scale and in an incomparably subtler manner than in other countries. The Soviet government has torn the veil of mystery from foreign policy in a revolutionary

manner. Kautsky has not noticed this, he keeps silent about it, although in the era of predatory wars and secret treaties for the "division of spheres of influence" (i.e., for the partition of the world among the capitalist bandits) this is of cardinal importance, for on it depends the question of peace, the life and death of tens of millions of people.

Take the structure of the state. Kautsky picks at all manner of "trifles", down to the argument that under the Soviet Constitution elections are "indirect", but he misses the point. He fails to see the *class* nature of the state apparatus, of the machinery of state. Under bourgeois democracy the capitalists, by thousands of tricks—which are the more artful and effective the more "pure" democracy is developed—*drive* the people away from administrative work, from freedom of the press, freedom of assembly, etc. The Soviet government is the *first* in the world (or strictly speaking, the second, because the Paris Commune began to do the same thing) to *enlist* the people, specifically the *exploited* people, in the work of administration. The working people are *barred* from participation in bourgeois parliaments (they *never decide* important questions under bourgeois democracy, which are decided by the stock exchange and the banks) by thousands of obstacles, and the workers know and feel, see and realise perfectly well that the bourgeois parliaments are institutions *alien* to them, *instruments for the oppression* of the workers by the bourgeoisie, institutions of a hostile class, of the exploiting minority.

The Soviets are the direct organisation of the working and exploited people themselves, which *helps* them to organise and administer their own state in every possible way. And in this it is the vanguard of the working and exploited people, the urban proletariat, that enjoys the advantage of being best united by the large enterprises; it is easier for it than for all others to elect and exercise control over those elected. The Soviet form of organisation automatically *helps* to unite all the working and exploited people around their vanguard, the proletariat. The old bourgeois apparatus—the bureaucracy, the privileges of wealth, of bourgeois education, of social connections, etc. (these real privileges are the more varied the more highly bourgeois democracy is developed)—all this disappears under the Soviet

form of organisation. Freedom of the press ceases to be hypocrisy, because the printing-plants and stocks of paper are taken away from the bourgeoisie. The same thing applies to the best buildings, the palaces, the mansions and manor-houses. Soviet power took thousands upon thousands of these best buildings from the exploiters at one stroke, and in this way made the right of assembly—without which democracy is a fraud—a *million times* more democratic for the people. Indirect elections to non-local Soviets make it easier to hold congresses of Soviets, they make the *entire* apparatus less costly, more flexible, more accessible to the workers and peasants at a time when life is seething and it is necessary to be able very quickly to recall one's local deputy or to delegate him to a general congress of Soviets.

Proletarian democracy is a *million times* more democratic than any bourgeois democracy; Soviet power is a million times more democratic than the most democratic bourgeois republic.

To fail to see this one must either deliberately serve the bourgeoisie, or be politically as dead as a doornail, unable to see real life from behind the dusty pages of bourgeois books, be thoroughly imbued with bourgeois-democratic prejudices, and thereby objectively convert oneself into a lackey of the bourgeoisie.

To fail to see this one must be incapable of *presenting the question* from the point of view of the *oppressed* classes:

Is there a single country in the world, even among the most democratic bourgeois countries, in which the *average rank-and-file* worker, the *average rank-and-file farm labourer*, or *village semi-proletarian* generally (i.e., the representative of the oppressed, of the overwhelming majority of the population), enjoys anything approaching such *liberty* of holding meetings in the best buildings, such *liberty* of using the largest printing-plants and biggest stocks of paper to express his ideas and to defend his interests, such *liberty* of promoting men and women of his own class to administer and to "knock into shape" the state, as in Soviet Russia?

It is ridiculous to think that Mr. Kautsky could find in any country even one out of a thousand of well-informed workers or farm labourers who would have any doubts as to

the reply. Instinctively, from hearing fragments of admissions of the truth in the bourgeois press, the workers of the whole world sympathise with the Soviet Republic precisely because they regard it as a *proletarian* democracy, a *democracy for the poor*, and not a democracy for the rich that every bourgeois democracy, even the best, actually is.

We are governed (and our state is "knocked into shape") by bourgeois bureaucrats, by bourgeois members of parliament, by bourgeois judges—such is the simple, obvious and indisputable truth which tens and hundreds of millions of people belonging to the oppressed classes in all bourgeois countries, including the most democratic, know from their own experience, feel and realise every day.

In Russia, however, the bureaucratic machine has been completely smashed, razed to the ground; the old judges have all been sent packing, the bourgeois parliament has been dispersed—and *far more accessible* representation has been given to the workers and peasants; *their* Soviets have replaced the bureaucrats, or *their* Soviets have been put in control of the bureaucrats, and *their* Soviets have been authorised to elect the judges. This fact alone is enough for all the oppressed classes to recognise that Soviet power, i.e., the present form of the dictatorship of the proletariat, is a million times more democratic than the most democratic bourgeois republic.

Kautsky does not understand this truth, which is so clear and obvious to every worker, because he has "forgotten", "unlearned" to put the question: democracy *for which class*? He argues from the point of view of "pure" (i.e., non-class? or above-class?) democracy. He argues like Shylock: my "pound of flesh" and nothing else. Equality for all citizens—otherwise there is no democracy.

We must ask the learned Kautsky, the "Marxist" and "socialist" Kautsky:

Can there be equality between the exploited and the exploiters?

It is dreadful, it is incredible that such a question should have to be put in discussing a book written by the ideological leader of the Second International. But "having put your hand to the plough, don't look back", and having

undertaken to write about Kautsky, I must explain to the learned man why there can be no equality between the exploiter and the exploited.

CAN THERE BE EQUALITY BETWEEN THE EXPLOITED AND THE EXPLOITER?

Kautsky argues as follows:

(1) "The exploiters have always formed only a small minority of the population" (p. 14 of Kautsky's pamphlet).

This is indisputably true. Taking this as the starting-point, what should be the argument? One may argue in a Marxist, a socialist way. In which case one would proceed from the relation between the exploited and the exploiters. Or one may argue in a liberal, a bourgeois-democratic way. And in that case one would proceed from the relation between the majority and the minority.

If we argue in a Marxist way, we must say: the exploiters inevitably transform the state (and we are speaking of democracy, i.e., one of the forms of the state) into an instrument of the rule of their class, the exploiters, over the exploited. Hence, as long as there are exploiters who rule the majority, the exploited, the democratic state must inevitably be a democracy for the exploiters. A state of the exploited must fundamentally differ from such a state; it must be a democracy for the exploited, and a means of *suppressing the exploiters*; and the suppression of a class means inequality for that class, its exclusion from "democracy".

If we argue in a liberal way, we must say: the majority decides, the minority submits. Those who do not submit are punished. That is all. Nothing need be said about the class character of the state in general, or of "pure democracy" in particular, because it is irrelevant; for a majority is a majority and a minority is a minority. A pound of flesh is a pound of flesh, and that is all there is to it.

And this is exactly how Kautsky argues.

(2) "Why should the rule of the proletariat assume, and necessarily assume, a form which is incompatible with democracy?" (P. 21.) Then follows a very detailed and a very verbose explanation, backed by a quotation from Marx

and the election figures of the Paris Commune, to the effect that the proletariat is in the majority. The conclusion is: "A regime which is so strongly rooted in the people has not the slightest reason for encroaching upon democracy. It cannot always dispense with violence in cases when violence is employed to suppress democracy. Violence can only be met with violence. But a regime which knows that it has popular backing will employ violence only to *protect* democracy and not to *destroy* it. It would be simply suicidal if it attempted to do away with its most reliable basis—universal suffrage, that deep source of mighty moral authority" (p. 22).

As you see, the relation between the exploited and the exploiters has vanished in Kautsky's argument. All that remains is majority in general, minority in general, democracy in general, the "pure democracy" with which we are already familiar.

And all this, mark you, is said *apropos of the Paris Commune!* To make things clearer I shall quote Marx and Engels to show what they said on the subject of dictatorship *apropos of the Paris Commune*:

Marx: "... When the workers replace the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie by their revolutionary dictatorship ... to break down the resistance of the bourgeoisie ... the workers invest the state with a revolutionary and transitional form...."¹⁰⁷

Engels: "... And the victorious party" (in a revolution) "must maintain its rule by means of the terror which its arms inspire in the reactionaries. Would the Paris Commune have lasted more than a day if it had not used the authority of the armed people against the bourgeoisie? Cannot we, on the contrary, blame it for having made too little use of that authority?..."¹⁰⁸

Engels: "As, therefore, the state is only a transitional institution which is used in the struggle, in the revolution, to hold down one's adversaries by force, it is sheer nonsense to talk of a 'free people's state'; so long as the proletariat still needs the state, it does not need it in the interests of freedom but in order to hold down its adversaries, and as soon as it becomes possible to speak of freedom the state as such ceases to exist...."¹⁰⁹

Kautsky is as far removed from Marx and Engels as heaven is from earth, as a liberal from a proletarian revolutionary. The pure democracy and simple "democracy" that Kautsky talks about is merely a paraphrase of the "free people's state", i.e., *sheer nonsense*. Kautsky, with the learned air of a most learned armchair fool, or with the innocent air of a ten-year-old schoolgirl, asks: Why do we need a dictatorship when we have a majority? And Marx and Engels explain:

- to break down the resistance of the bourgeoisie;
- to inspire the reactionaries with fear;
- to maintain the authority of the armed people against the bourgeoisie;
- that the proletariat may forcibly hold down its adversaries.

Kautsky does not understand these explanations. Infatuated with the "purity" of democracy, blind to its bourgeois character, he "consistently" urges that the majority, since it is the majority, need not "break down the resistance" of the minority, nor "forcibly hold it down"—it is sufficient to suppress *cases* of infringement of democracy. Infatuated with the "purity" of democracy, Kautsky *inadvertently* commits the same little error that all bourgeois democrats always commit, namely, he takes formal equality (which is nothing but a fraud and hypocrisy under capitalism) for actual equality! Quite a trifle!

The exploiter and the exploited cannot be equal.

This truth, however unpleasant it may be to Kautsky, nevertheless forms the essence of socialism.

Another truth: there can be no real, actual equality until all possibility of the exploitation of one class by another has been totally destroyed.

The exploiters can be defeated at one stroke in the event of a successful uprising at the centre, or of a revolt in the army. But except in very rare and special cases, the exploiters cannot be destroyed at one stroke. It is impossible to expropriate all the landowners and capitalists of any big country at one stroke. Furthermore, expropriation alone, as a legal or political act, does not settle the matter by a long chalk, because it is necessary to *depose* the landowners and capitalists in actual fact, to *replace* their management

of the factories and estates by a different management, workers' management, in actual fact. There can be no equality between the exploiters—who for many generations have been better off because of their education, conditions of wealthy life, and habits—and the exploited, the majority of whom even in the most advanced and most democratic bourgeois republics are downtrodden, backward, ignorant, intimidated and disunited. For a long time after the revolution the exploiters inevitably continue to retain a number of great practical advantages: they still have money (since it is impossible to abolish money all at once); some movable property—often fairly considerable; they still have various connections, habits of organisation and management; knowledge of all the "secrets" (customs, methods, means and possibilities) of management; superior education; close connections with the higher technical personnel (who live and think like the bourgeoisie); incomparably greater experience in the art of war (this is very important), and so on and so forth.

If the exploiters are defeated in one country only—and this, of course, is typical, since a simultaneous revolution in a number of countries is a rare exception—they still remain *stronger* than the exploited, for the international connections of the exploiters are enormous. That a section of the exploited from the least advanced middle-peasant, artisan and similar groups of the population may, and indeed does, follow the exploiters has been proved by *all* revolutions, including the Commune (for there were also proletarians among the Versailles troops, which the most learned Kautsky has "forgotten").

In these circumstances, to assume that in a revolution which is at all profound and serious the issue is decided simply by the relation between the majority and the minority is the acme of stupidity, the silliest prejudice of a common liberal, an attempt to *deceive the people* by concealing from them a well-established historical truth. This historical truth is that in every profound revolution, the *prolonged, stubborn and desperate* resistance of the exploiters, who for a number of years retain important practical advantages over the exploited, is the *rule*. Never—except in the sentimental fantasies of the sentimental fool Kautsky—will the exploiters submit to the decision of the exploited

majority without trying to make use of their advantages in a last desperate battle, or series of battles.

The transition from capitalism to communism takes an entire historical epoch. Until this epoch is over, the exploiters inevitably cherish the hope of restoration, and this *hope* turns into *attempts* at restoration. After their first serious defeat, the overthrown exploiters—who had not expected their overthrow, never believed it possible, never conceded the thought of it—throw themselves with energy grown tenfold, with furious passion and hatred grown a hundredfold, into the battle for the recovery of the “paradise”, of which they were deprived, on behalf of their families, who had been leading such a sweet and easy life and whom now the “common herd” is condemning to ruin and destitution (or to “common” labour...). In the train of the capitalist exploiters follow the wide sections of the petty bourgeoisie, with regard to whom decades of historical experience of all countries testify that they vacillate and hesitate, one day marching behind the proletariat and the next day taking fright at the difficulties of the revolution; that they become panic-stricken at the first defeat or semi-defeat of the workers, grow nervous, run about aimlessly, snivel, and rush from one camp into the other—just like our Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries.

In these circumstances, in an epoch of desperately acute war, when history presents the question of whether age-old and thousand-year-old privileges are to be or not to be—at such a time to talk about majority and minority, about pure democracy, about dictatorship being unnecessary and about equality between the exploiter and the exploited! What infinite stupidity and abysmal philistinism are needed for this!

However, during the decades of comparatively “peaceful” capitalism between 1871 and 1914, the Augean stables of philistinism, imbecility, and apostasy accumulated in the socialist parties which were adapting themselves to opportunism....

* * *

The reader will probably have noticed that Kautsky, in the passage from his pamphlet quoted above, speaks of an

attempt to encroach upon universal suffrage (calling it, by the way, a deep source of mighty moral authority, whereas Engels, apropos of the same Paris Commune and the same question of dictatorship, spoke of the authority of the armed people against the bourgeoisie—a very characteristic difference between the philistine's and the revolutionary's views on "authority"...).

It should be observed that the question of depriving the exploiters of the franchise is a *purely Russian* question, and not a question of the dictatorship of the proletariat in general. Had Kautsky, casting aside hypocrisy, entitled his pamphlet *Against the Bolsheviks*, the title would have corresponded to the contents of the pamphlet, and Kautsky would have been justified in speaking bluntly about the franchise. But Kautsky wanted to come out primarily as a "theoretician". He called his pamphlet *The Dictatorship of the Proletariat—in general*. He speaks about the Soviets and about Russia specifically only in the second part of the pamphlet, beginning with the sixth paragraph. The subject dealt with in the first part (from which I took the quotation) is *democracy and dictatorship in general*. In speaking about the franchise, Kautsky *betrayed himself* as an opponent of the Bolsheviks, *who does not care a brass farthing for theory*. For theory, i.e., the reasoning about the general (and not the nationally specific) class foundations of democracy and dictatorship, ought to deal not with a special question, such as the franchise, but with the general question of whether democracy can be *preserved for the rich, for the exploiters* in the historical period of the overthrow of the exploiters and the replacement of their state by the state of the exploited.

That is the way, the only way, a theoretician can present the question.

We know the example of the Paris Commune, we know all that was said by the founders of Marxism in connection with it and in reference to it. On the basis of this material I examined, for instance, the question of democracy and dictatorship in my pamphlet, *The State and Revolution*, written before the October Revolution. *I did not say anything at all* about restricting the franchise. And it must be said now that the question of restricting the franchise is

a nationally specific and not a general question of the dictatorship. One must approach the question of restricting the franchise by studying the *specific conditions* of the Russian revolution and the *specific path* of its development. This will be done later on in this pamphlet. It would be a mistake, however, to guarantee in advance that the impending proletarian revolutions in Europe will all, or the majority of them, be necessarily accompanied by restriction of the franchise for the bourgeoisie. It may be so. After the war and the experience of the Russian revolution it probably will be so; but it is *not absolutely necessary* for the exercise of the dictatorship, it is not an *indispensable* characteristic of the logical concept "dictatorship", it does not enter as an *indispensable* condition in the historical and class concept "dictatorship".

The indispensable characteristic, the necessary condition of dictatorship is the *forcible suppression* of the exploiters as a *class*, and, consequently, the *infringement* of "pure democracy", i.e., of equality and freedom, *in regard to that class*.

This is the way, the only way, the question can be put theoretically. And by failing to put the question thus, Kautsky has shown that he opposes the Bolsheviks not as a theoretician, but as a sycophant of the opportunists and the bourgeoisie.

In which countries, and given what national features of capitalism, democracy for the exploiters will be in one or another form restricted (wholly or in part), infringed upon, is a question of the specific national features of this or that capitalism, of this or that revolution. The theoretical question is different: Is the dictatorship of the proletariat possible *without infringing democracy* in relation to the *exploiting class*?

It is precisely this question, the *only* theoretically important and essential one, that Kautsky has evaded. He has quoted all sorts of passages from Marx and Engels, *except those* which bear on this question, and which I quoted above.

Kautsky talks about anything you like, about everything that is acceptable to liberals and bourgeois democrats and does not go beyond their circle of ideas, but he does not talk about the main thing, namely, the fact that the prole-

tariat cannot achieve victory *without breaking the resistance of the bourgeoisie, without forcibly suppressing its adversaries*, and that, where there is "forcible suppression", where there is no "freedom", *there is, of course, no democracy*.

This Kautsky has not understood.

* * *

We shall now examine the experience of the Russian revolution and that divergence between the Soviets of Deputies and the Constituent Assembly which led to the dissolution of the latter and to the withdrawal of the franchise from the bourgeoisie.

THE SOVIETS DARE NOT BECOME STATE ORGANISATIONS

The Soviets are the Russian form of the proletarian dictatorship. If a Marxist theoretician, writing a work on the dictatorship of the proletariat, had really studied the subject (and not merely repeated the petty-bourgeois lamentations against dictatorship, as Kautsky did, singing to Menshevik tunes), he would first have given a general definition of dictatorship, and would then have examined its peculiar, national, form, the Soviets; he would have given his critique of them as one of the forms of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

It goes without saying that nothing serious could be expected from Kautsky after his liberalistic "interpretation" of Marx's teaching on dictatorship; but the manner in which he approached the question of what the Soviets are and the way he dealt with this question is highly characteristic.

The Soviets, he says, recalling their rise in 1905, created "the most all-embracing (*umfassendste*) form of proletarian organisation, for it embraced all the wage-workers" (p. 31). In 1905 they were only local bodies; in 1917 they became a national organisation.

"The Soviet form of organisation." Kautsky continues, "already has a great and glorious history behind it, and it has a still mightier future before it, and not in Russia alone. It appears that everywhere the old methods of the economic and political struggle of the proletariat are inadequate" (*versagen*; this German expression is somewhat stronger

than "inadequate" and somewhat weaker than "impotent") "against the gigantic economic and political forces which finance capital has at its disposal. These old methods cannot be discarded; they are still indispensable for normal times; but from time to time tasks arise which they cannot cope with, tasks that can be accomplished successfully only as a result of a combination of all the political and economic instruments of force of the working class" (p. 32).

Then follows a reasoning on the mass strike and on "trade union bureaucracy"—which is no less necessary than the trade unions—being "useless for the purpose of directing the mighty mass battles that are more and more becoming a sign of the times...."

"Thus," Kautsky concludes, "the Soviet form of organisation is one of the most important phenomena of our time. It promises to acquire decisive importance in the great decisive battles between capital and labour towards which we are marching.

"But are we entitled to demand more of the Soviets? The Bolsheviks, after the November Revolution" (new style, or October, according to our style) "1917, secured in conjunction with the Left Socialist-Revolutionaries a majority in the Russian Soviets of Workers' Deputies, and after the dispersion of the Constituent Assembly, they set out to transform the Soviets from a *combat organisation* of one *class*, as they had been up to then, into a *state organisation*. They destroyed the democracy which the Russian people had won in the March" (new style, or February, our style) "Revolution. In line with this, the Bolsheviks have ceased to call themselves Social-Democrats. They call themselves *Communists*" (p. 33, Kautsky's italics).

Those who are familiar with Russian Menshevik literature will at once see how slavishly Kautsky copies Martov, Axelrod, Stein and Co. Yes, "slavishly", because Kautsky ridiculously distorts the facts in order to pander to Menshevik prejudices. Kautsky did not take the trouble, for instance, to ask his informants (Stein of Berlin, or Axelrod of Stockholm) *when* the questions of changing the name of the Bolsheviks to Communists and of the significance of the Soviets as state organisations were first raised. Had Kautsky made this simple inquiry he would not have penned these ludicrous lines, for both these questions were raised by the Bolsheviks *in April 1917*, for example, in my "Theses" of April 4, 1917, i.e., *long before* the Revolution of October 1917 (and, of course, long before the dissolution of the Constituent Assembly on January 5, 1918).

But Kautsky's argument which I have just quoted in full represents the *crux* of the whole question of the Soviets.

The crux is: should the Soviets aspire to become state organisations (in April 1917 the Bolsheviks put forward the slogan: "All Power to the Soviets!" and at the Bolshevik Party Conference held in the same month they declared they were not satisfied with a bourgeois parliamentary republic but demanded a workers' and peasants' republic of the Paris Commune or Soviet type); or should the Soviets not strive for this, refrain from taking power into their hands, refrain from becoming state organisations and remain the "combat organisations" of one "class" (as Martov expressed it, embellishing by this innocent wish the fact that under Menshevik leadership the Soviets were *an instrument for the subjection of the workers to the bourgeoisie*)?

Kautsky slavishly repeats Martov's words, picks out *fragments* of the theoretical controversy between the Bolsheviks and the Mensheviks, and uncritically and senselessly transplants them to the general theoretical and general European field. The result is such a hodge-podge as to provoke Homeric laughter in every class-conscious Russian worker had he read these arguments of Kautsky's.

When we explain what the question at issue is, every worker in Europe (barring a handful of inveterate social-imperialists) will greet Kautsky with similar laughter.

Kautsky has rendered Martov a backhanded service by developing his mistake into a glaring absurdity. Indeed, look what Kautsky's argument amounts to.

The Soviets embrace all wage-workers. The old methods of economic and political struggle of the proletariat are inadequate against finance capital. The Soviets have a great role to play in the future, and not only in Russia. They will play a decisive role in great decisive battles between capital and labour in Europe. That is what Kautsky says.

Excellent. But won't the "decisive battles between capital and labour" decide which of the two classes will assume state power?

Nothing of the kind! Heaven forbid!

The Soviets, which embrace all the wage-workers, *must not become state organisations* in the "decisive" battles!

But what is the state?

The state is nothing but a machine for the suppression of one class by another.

Thus, the oppressed class, the vanguard of all the working and exploited people in modern society, must strive towards the "decisive battles between capital and labour", *but must not touch* the machine by means of which capital suppresses labour!—*It must not break up* that machine!—*It must not make use of* its all-embracing organisation *for suppressing the exploiters!*

Excellent, Mr. Kautsky, magnificent! "We" recognise the class struggle—in the same way as all liberals recognise it, i.e., without the overthrow of the bourgeoisie....

This is where Kautsky's complete rupture both with Marxism and with socialism becomes obvious. Actually, it is desertion to the camp of the bourgeoisie, who are prepared to concede everything except the transformation of the organisations of the class which they oppress into state organisations. Kautsky can no longer save his position of trying to reconcile everything and of getting away from all profound contradictions with mere phrases.

Kautsky either rejects the assumption of state power by the working class altogether, or he concedes that the working class may take over the old, bourgeois state machine. But he will by no means concede that it must break it up, smash it, and replace it by a new, proletarian machine. Whichever way Kautsky's arguments are "interpreted", or "explained", his rupture with Marxism and his desertion to the bourgeoisie are obvious.

Back in the *Communist Manifesto*, describing what sort of state the victorious working class needs, Marx wrote: "the state, i.e., the proletariat organised as the ruling class."¹¹⁰ Now we have a man who claims still to be a Marxist coming forward and declaring that the proletariat, fully organised and waging the "decisive battle" against capital, *must not* transform its class organisation into a state organisation. Here Kautsky has betrayed that "superstitious belief in the state" which in Germany, as Engels wrote in 1891, "has been carried over into the general thinking of the bourgeoisie and even of many workers".¹¹¹ Workers, fight!—our philistine "agrees" to this (as every bourgeois "agrees", since the workers are fighting all the same, and the only thing to do is to devise means of blunting the edge of their sword)—fight, but *don't dare win!* Don't

destroy the state machine of the bourgeoisie, don't replace the bourgeois "state organisation" by the proletarian "state organisation"!

Whoever sincerely shared the Marxist view that the state is nothing but a machine for the suppression of one class by another, and who has at all reflected upon this truth, could never have reached the absurd conclusion that the proletarian organisations capable of defeating finance capital must not transform themselves into state organisations. It was this point that betrayed the petty bourgeois who believes that "after all is said and done" the state is something outside classes or above classes. Indeed, why should the proletariat, "one class", be permitted to wage unremitting war on *capital*, which rules not only over the proletariat, but over the whole people, over the whole petty bourgeoisie, over all the peasants, yet this proletariat, this "one class", is not to be permitted to transform its organisation into a state organisation? Because the petty bourgeois is *afraid* of the class struggle, and does not carry it to its logical conclusion, *to its main object*.

Kautsky has got himself completely mixed up and has given himself away entirely. Mark you, he himself admits that Europe is heading for decisive battles between capital and labour, and that the old methods of economic and political struggle of the proletariat are inadequate. But these old methods were precisely the utilisation of *bourgeois* democracy. It therefore follows...?

But Kautsky is afraid to think of what follows.

...It therefore follows that only a reactionary, an enemy of the working class, a henchman of the bourgeoisie, can now turn his face to the obsolete past, paint the charms of bourgeois democracy and babble about pure democracy. Bourgeois democracy *was* progressive compared with mediævalism, and it had to be utilised. But now it is *not sufficient* for the working class. Now we must look forward instead of backward—to replacing the bourgeois democracy by *proletarian* democracy. And while the preparatory work for the proletarian revolution, the formation and training of the proletarian army were possible (and necessary) *within the framework* of the bourgeois-democratic state, now that we have reached the stage of "decisive battles", to confine the

proletariat to this framework means betraying the cause of the proletariat, means being a renegade.

Kautsky has made himself particularly ridiculous by repeating Martov's argument *without noticing* that in Martov's case this argument was based on *another* argument which he, Kautsky, does not use! Martov said (and Kautsky repeats after him) that Russia is not yet ripe for socialism; from which it logically follows that it is too early to transform the Soviets from organs of struggle into state organisations (read: it is timely to transform the Soviets, with the assistance of the Menshevik leaders, into instruments for *subjecting* the workers to the imperialist bourgeoisie). Kautsky, however, *cannot* say outright that Europe is not ripe for socialism. In 1909, when he was not yet a renegade, he wrote that there was then no reason to fear a *premature* revolution, that whoever had renounced revolution for fear of defeat would have been a traitor. Kautsky does not dare renounce this *outright*. And so we get an absurdity, which completely reveals the stupidity and cowardice of the petty bourgeoisie: on the one hand, Europe is ripe for socialism and is heading towards decisive battles between capital and labour; but, on the other hand, the *combat organisation* (i.e., the organisation which arises, grows and gains strength in combat), the organisation of the proletariat, the vanguard and organiser, the leader of the oppressed, *must not* be transformed into a state organisation!

* * *

From the point of view of practical politics the idea that the Soviets are necessary as combat organisations but must not be transformed into state organisations is infinitely more absurd than from the point of view of theory. Even in peacetime, when there is no revolutionary situation, the mass struggle of the workers against the capitalists—for instance, the mass strike—gives rise to great bitterness on both sides, to fierce passions in the struggle, the bourgeoisie constantly insisting that they remain and mean to remain “masters in their own house”, etc. And in time of revolution, when political life reaches boiling point, an organisation like the Soviets, which embraces *all* the workers in *all*

branches of industry, *all* the soldiers, and all the working and poorest sections of the rural population—such an organisation, of its own accord, with the development of the struggle, by the simple “logic” of attack and defence, comes inevitably to pose the question *point-blank*. The attempt to take up a middle position and to “reconcile” the proletariat with the bourgeoisie is sheer stupidity and doomed to miserable failure. That is what happened in Russia to the preachings of Martov and other Mensheviks, and that will inevitably happen in Germany and other countries if the Soviets succeed in developing on any wide scale, manage to unite and strengthen. To say to the Soviets: fight; but don’t take all state power into your hands, don’t become state organisations—is tantamount to preaching class collaboration and “social peace” between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. It is ridiculous even to think that such a position in the midst of fierce struggle could lead to anything but ignominious failure. But it is Kautsky’s everlasting fate to sit between two stools. He pretends to disagree with the opportunists on everything in theory, but *in practice* he agrees with them on everything essential (i.e., on everything pertaining to revolution).

THE CONSTITUENT ASSEMBLY AND THE SOVIET REPUBLIC

The question of the Constituent Assembly and its dispersal by the Bolsheviks is the crux of Kautsky’s entire pamphlet. He constantly reverts to it, and the whole of this literary production of the ideological leader of the Second International is replete with innuendoes to the effect that the Bolsheviks have “destroyed democracy” (see one of the quotations from Kautsky above). The question is really an interesting and important one, because the relation between bourgeois democracy and proletarian democracy here confronted the revolution in a *practical* form. Let us see how our “Marxist theoretician” has dealt with the question.

He quotes the “Theses on the Constituent Assembly”, written by me and published in *Pravda* on December 26, 1917. One would think that no better evidence of Kaut-

sky's serious approach to the subject, quoting as he does the documents, could be desired. But look *how* he quotes. He does not say that there were nineteen of these theses; he does not say that they dealt with the relation between the ordinary bourgeois republic with a Constituent Assembly and a Soviet republic, as well as with the *history* of the divergence in our revolution between the Constituent Assembly and the dictatorship of the proletariat. Kautsky ignores all that, and simply tells the reader that "two of them" (of the theses) "are particularly important": one stating that a split occurred among the Socialist-Revolutionaries after the elections to the Constituent Assembly, but before it was convened (Kautsky does not mention that this was the fifth thesis), and the other, that the republic of Soviets is in general a higher democratic form than the Constituent Assembly (Kautsky does not mention that this was the third thesis).

Only from this third thesis does Kautsky quote a part in full, namely, the following passage:

"The republic of Soviets is not only a higher type of democratic institution (as compared with the *usual* bourgeois republic crowned by a Constituent Assembly), but is the only form capable of securing the most painless * transition to socialism" (Kautsky omits the word "usual" and the introductory words of the thesis: "For the transition from the bourgeois to the socialist system, for the dictatorship of the proletariat").

After quoting these words, Kautsky, with magnificent irony, exclaims:

"It is a pity that this conclusion was arrived at only after the Bolsheviks found themselves in the minority in the Constituent Assembly. Before that no one had demanded it more vociferously than Lenin."

* Incidentally, Kautsky, obviously trying to be ironical, repeatedly quotes the expression "most painless" transition; but as the shaft misses its mark, a few pages farther on he commits a slight forgery and falsely quotes it as a "painless" transition! Of course, by such means it is easy to put any absurdity into the mouth of an opponent. The forgery also helps him to evade the substance of the argument, namely, that the most painless transition to socialism is possible only when all the poor are organised to a man (Soviets) and when the core of state power (the proletariat) helps them to organise.

This is literally what Kautsky says on page 31 of his book! It is positively a gem! Only a sycophant of the bourgeoisie could present the question in such a false way as to give the reader the impression that all the Bolsheviks' talk about a higher type of state was an invention which saw light of day *after* they found themselves in the minority in the Constituent Assembly! Such an infamous lie could only have been uttered by a scoundrel who has sold himself to the bourgeoisie, or, what is absolutely the same thing, who has placed his trust in Axelrod and is concealing the source of his information.

For everyone knows that on the very day of my arrival in Russia, on April 4, 1917, I publicly read my theses in which I proclaimed the superiority of the Paris Commune type of state over the bourgeois parliamentary republic. Afterwards I *repeatedly* stated this in print, as, for instance, in a pamphlet on political parties, which was translated into English and was published in January 1918 in the New York *Evening Post*.¹¹² More than that, the Conference of the Bolshevik Party held at the end of April 1917 adopted a resolution to the effect that a proletarian and peasant republic was superior to a bourgeois parliamentary republic, that our Party would not be satisfied with the latter, and that the Party Programme should be modified accordingly.

In face of these facts, what name can be given to Kautsky's trick of assuring his German readers that I had been vigorously demanding the convocation of the Constituent Assembly, and that I began to "belittle" the honour and dignity of the Constituent Assembly only after the Bolsheviks found themselves in the minority in it? How can one excuse such a trick?* By pleading that Kautsky did not know the facts? If that is the case, why did he undertake to write about them? Or why did he not honestly announce that he was writing on the strength of information supplied by the Mensheviks Stein and Axelrod and Co.? By pretending to be objective, Kautsky wants to conceal his role as the servant of the Mensheviks, who are disgruntled because they have been defeated.

* Incidentally, there are many Menshevik lies of this kind in Kautsky's pamphlet! It is a lampoon written by an embittered Menshevik.

This, however, is a mere trifle compared with what is to come.

Let us assume that Kautsky would not or could not (?) obtain from his informants a translation of the Bolshevik resolutions and declarations on the question of whether the Bolsheviks would be satisfied with a bourgeois parliamentary democratic republic or not. Let us assume this, although it is incredible. But Kautsky *directly mentions* my theses of December 26, 1917, on page 30 of his book.

Does he not know these theses in full, or does he know only what was translated for him by the Steins, the Axelrods and Co.? Kautsky quotes the *third* thesis on the *fundamental* question of whether the Bolsheviks, *before* the elections to the Constituent Assembly, realised that a Soviet republic is superior to a bourgeois republic, and whether they told the people that. *But he keeps silent about the second thesis.*

The second thesis reads as follows:

"While demanding the convocation of a Constituent Assembly, revolutionary Social-Democracy has ever since the beginning of the revolution of 1917 repeatedly emphasised that a republic of Soviets is a higher form of democracy than the usual bourgeois republic with a Constituent Assembly" (my italics).

In order to represent the Bolsheviks as unprincipled people, as "revolutionary opportunists" (this is a term which Kautsky employs somewhere in his book, I forget in which connection), Mr. Kautsky *has concealed from his German readers* the fact that the theses contain a direct reference to "repeated" declarations!

These are the petty, miserable and contemptible methods Mr. Kautsky employs! That is the way he has evaded the *theoretical* question.

Is it true or not that the bourgeois-democratic parliamentary republic is *inferior* to the republic of the Paris Commune or Soviet type? This is the whole point, and Kautsky has evaded it. Kautsky has "forgotten" all that Marx said in his analysis of the Paris Commune. He has also "forgotten" Engels's letter to Bebel of March 28, 1875, in which this same idea of Marx is formulated in a particularly lucid and comprehensible fashion: "The Commune was no longer a state in the proper sense of the word."

Here is the most prominent theoretician of the Second International, in a special pamphlet on *The Dictatorship of the Proletariat*, specially dealing with Russia, where the question of a form of state that is higher than a democratic bourgeois republic has been raised directly and repeatedly, ignoring this very question. In what way does this differ *in fact* from desertion to the bourgeois camp?

(Let us observe in parenthesis that in this respect, too, Kautsky is merely trailing after the Russian Mensheviks. Among the latter there are any number of people who know "all the quotations" from Marx and Engels. Yet not a single Menshevik, from April to October 1917 and from October 1917 to October 1918, has ever made a *single* attempt to examine the question of the Paris Commune type of state. Plekhanov, too, has evaded the question. *Evidently he had to.*)

It goes without saying that to discuss the dispersal of the Constituent Assembly¹¹ with people who call themselves socialists and Marxists, but who in fact desert to the bourgeoisie on the *main* question, the question of the Paris Commune type of state, would be casting pearls before swine. It will be sufficient to give the complete text of my theses on the Constituent Assembly as an appendix to the present book. The reader will then see that the question was presented on December 26, 1917, in the light of theory, history and practical politics.

If Kautsky has completely renounced Marxism as a theoretician he might at least have examined the question of the struggle of the Soviets with the Constituent Assembly as a historian. We know from many of Kautsky's works that he *knew how* to be a Marxist historian, and that *such* works of his will remain a permanent possession of the proletariat in spite of his subsequent apostasy. But on this question Kautsky, even as a historian, *turns his back* on the truth, ignores *well-known* facts and behaves like a sycophant. He *wants* to represent the Bolsheviks as being unprincipled and he tells his readers that they tried to *mitigate* the conflict with the Constituent Assembly before dispersing it. There is absolutely nothing wrong about it, we have nothing to recant; I give the theses in full and there it is said as clear as clear can be: Gentlemen of the vacillating petty bour-

geoisie entrenched in the Constituent Assembly, either reconcile yourselves to the proletarian dictatorship, or else we shall defeat you by "revolutionary means" (theses 18 and 19).

That is how a really revolutionary proletariat has always behaved and always will behave towards the vacillating petty bourgeoisie.

Kautsky adopts a formal standpoint on the question of the Constituent Assembly. My theses say clearly and repeatedly that the interests of the revolution are higher than the formal rights of the Constituent Assembly (see theses 16 and 17). The formal democratic point of view is precisely the point of view of the *bourgeois* democrat who refuses to admit that the interests of the proletariat and of the proletarian class struggle are supreme. As a historian, Kautsky would not have been able to deny that bourgeois parliaments are the organs of this or that class. But now (for the sordid purpose of renouncing revolution) Kautsky finds it necessary to forget his Marxism, and he *refrains from putting the question*: the organ of what *class* was the Constituent Assembly of Russia? Kautsky does not examine the concrete conditions; he does not want to face facts; he does not say a single word to his German readers about the fact that the theses contained not only a theoretical elucidation of the question of the limited character of bourgeois democracy (theses 1-3), not only a description of the concrete conditions which determined the discrepancy between the party lists of candidates in the middle of October 1917 and the real state of affairs in December 1917 (theses 4-6), but also a *history of the class struggle and the Civil War* in October-December 1917 (theses 7-15). From this concrete history we drew the conclusion (thesis 14) that the slogan "All Power to the Constituent Assembly!" had, *in reality*, become the slogan of the Cadets and the Kaledin men and their abettors.

Kautsky the historian fails to see this. Kautsky the historian has never heard that universal suffrage sometimes produces petty-bourgeois, sometimes reactionary and counter-revolutionary parliaments. Kautsky the Marxist historian has never heard that the form of elections, the form of democracy, is one thing, and the class content of the given

institution is another. This question of the class content of the Constituent Assembly is directly put and answered in my theses. Perhaps my answer is wrong. Nothing would have been more welcome to us than a Marxist criticism of our analysis by an outsider. Instead of writing utterly silly phrases (of which there are plenty in Kautsky's book) about somebody preventing criticism of Bolshevism, he ought to have set out to make such a criticism. But the point is that he offers no criticism. He does not even *raise the question* of a class analysis of the Soviets on the one hand, and of the Constituent Assembly on the other. It is therefore *impossible* to argue, to debate with Kautsky. All we can do is *demonstrate* to the reader why Kautsky cannot be called anything else but a renegade.

The divergence between the Soviets and the Constituent Assembly has its history, which even a historian who does not share the point of view of the class struggle could not have ignored. Kautsky would not *touch* upon this actual history. Kautsky has concealed from his German readers the universally known fact (which only malignant Mensheviks now conceal) that the divergence between the Soviets and the "general state" (that is, bourgeois) institutions existed even under the rule of the Mensheviks, i.e., from the end of February to October 1917. Actually, Kautsky adopts the position of conciliation, compromise and collaboration between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. However much Kautsky may repudiate this, it is a fact which is borne out by his whole pamphlet. To say that the Constituent Assembly should not have been dispersed is tantamount to saying that the fight against the bourgeoisie should not have been fought to a finish, that the bourgeoisie should not have been overthrown and that the proletariat should have made peace with them.

Why has Kautsky kept quiet about the fact that the Mensheviks were engaged in this inglorious work between February and October 1917 and did not achieve anything? If it was possible to reconcile the bourgeoisie with the proletariat, why didn't the Mensheviks succeed in doing so? Why did the bourgeoisie stand aloof from the Soviets? Why did the Mensheviks call the Soviets "revolutionary democracy", and the bourgeoisie the "propertied elements"?

Kautsky has concealed from his German readers that it was the Mensheviks who, in the "epoch" of their rule (February to October 1917), called the Soviets "revolutionary democracy", *thereby* admitting their superiority over all other institutions. It is only by concealing this fact that Kautsky the historian made it appear that the divergence between the Soviets and the bourgeoisie had no history, that it arose instantaneously, without cause, suddenly, because of the bad behaviour of the Bolsheviks. Yet, in actual fact, it was *the more than six months'* (an enormous period in time of revolution) *experience* of Menshevik compromise, of their attempts to reconcile the proletariat with the bourgeoisie, that convinced the people of the fruitlessness of these attempts and drove the proletariat away from the Mensheviks.

Kautsky admits that the Soviets are an excellent combat organisation of the proletariat, and that they have a great future before them. But, that being the case, Kautsky's position collapses like a house of cards, or like the dreams of a petty bourgeois that the acute struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie can be avoided. For revolution is one continuous and moreover desperate struggle, and the proletariat is the vanguard class of *all* the oppressed, the focus and centre of all the aspirations of all the oppressed for their emancipation! Naturally, therefore, the Soviets, as the organ of the struggle of the oppressed people, reflected and expressed the moods and changes of opinions of these people ever so much more quickly, fully, and faithfully than any other institution (that, incidentally, is one of the reasons why Soviet democracy is the highest type of democracy).

In the period between February 28 (old style) and October 25, 1917, the Soviets managed to convene *two* all-Russia congresses of representatives of the overwhelming majority of the population of Russia, of all the workers and soldiers, and of 70 or 80 per cent of the peasants, not to mention the vast number of local, uyezd, town, gubernia, and regional congresses. During this period the bourgeoisie did not succeed in convening a single institution representing the majority (except that obvious sham and mockery called the "Democratic Conference",¹¹⁴ which enraged the

proletariat). The Constituent Assembly reflected *the same* popular mood and *the same* political grouping as the First (June) All-Russia Congress of Soviets. By the time the Constituent Assembly was convened (January 1918), the Second (October 1917) and Third (January 1918) Congresses of Soviets had met, both of which had *demonstrated as clear as clear could be* that the people had swung to the left, had become revolutionised, had turned away from the Mensheviks and the Socialist-Revolutionaries, and had passed over to the side of the Bolsheviks; *that is*, had turned away from petty-bourgeois leadership, from the illusion that it was possible to reach a compromise with the bourgeoisie, and had joined the proletarian revolutionary struggle for the overthrow of the bourgeoisie.

So, even the *external history* of the Soviets shows that the Constituent Assembly was a *reactionary* body and that its dispersal was inevitable. But Kautsky sticks firmly to his "slogan": let "pure democracy" prevail though the revolution perish and the bourgeoisie triumph over the proletariat! *Fiat justitia, pereat mundus!**

Here are the brief figures relating to the all-Russia congresses of Soviets in the course of the history of the Russian revolution:

| All-Russia Congress of Soviets | Number of Delegates | Number of Bolsheviks | Percentage of Bolsheviks |
|---------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|
| First (June 3, 1917) . . . | 790 | 103 | 13 |
| Second (October 25, 1917) . . . | 675 | 343 | 51 |
| Third (January 10, 1918) . . . | 710 | 434 | 61 |
| Fourth (March 14, 1918) . . . | 1,232 | 795 | 64 |
| Fifth (July 4, 1918) . . . | 1,164 | 773 | 66 |

One glance at these figures is enough to understand why the defence of the Constituent Assembly and talk (like Kautsky's) about the Bolsheviks not having a majority of the population behind them are just ridiculed in Russia.

THE SOVIET CONSTITUTION

As I have already pointed out, the disfranchisement of the bourgeoisie is not a necessary and indispensable feature of the dictatorship of the proletariat. And in Russia, the

* Let justice be done, even though the world may perish.—Ed.

Bolsheviks, who long before October put forward the slogan of proletarian dictatorship, did not say anything in advance about disfranchising the exploiters. *This* aspect of the dictatorship did not make its appearance "according to the plan" of any particular party; it *emerged* of itself in the course of the struggle. Of course, Kautsky the historian failed to notice this. He failed to understand that even when the Mensheviks (who compromised with the bourgeoisie) still ruled the Soviets, the bourgeoisie cut themselves off from the Soviets of their own accord, boycotted them, put themselves up in opposition to them and intrigued against them. The Soviets arose without any constitution and existed without one for *more than a year* (from the spring of 1917 to the summer of 1918). The fury of the bourgeoisie against this independent and omnipotent (because it was all-embracing) organisation of the oppressed; the fight, the unscrupulous, self-seeking and sordid fight, the bourgeoisie waged against the Soviets; and, lastly, the overt participation of the bourgeoisie (from the Cadets to the Right Socialist-Revolutionaries, from Milyukov to Kerensky) in the Kornilov mutiny¹¹—all this paved the way for the formal exclusion of the bourgeoisie from the Soviets.

Kautsky has heard about the Kornilov mutiny, but he majestically scorns historical facts and the course and forms of the struggle which determine the *forms* of the dictatorship. Indeed, who should care about facts where "pure" democracy is involved? That is why Kautsky's "criticism" of the disfranchisement of the bourgeoisie is distinguished by such ... sweet naïveté, which would be touching in a child but is repulsive in a person who has not yet been officially certified as feeble-minded.

"...If the capitalists found themselves in an insignificant minority under universal suffrage they would more readily become reconciled to their fate" (p. 33).... Charming, isn't it? Clever Kautsky has seen many cases in history, and, generally, knows perfectly well from his own observations of life of landowners and capitalists reckoning with the will of the majority of the oppressed. Clever Kautsky firmly advocates an "opposition", i.e., parliamentary struggle. That is literally what he says: "opposition" (p. 34 and elsewhere).

My dear learned historian and politician! It would not harm you to know that "opposition" is a concept that belongs to the peaceful and only to the parliamentary struggle, i.e., a concept that corresponds to a non-revolutionary situation, a concept that corresponds to an *absence of revolution*. During revolution we have to deal with a ruthless enemy in civil war; and no reactionary jeremiads of a petty bourgeois who fears such a war, as Kautsky does, will alter the fact. To examine the problems of ruthless civil war from the point of view of "opposition" at a time when the bourgeoisie are prepared to commit any crime—the example of the Versailles men and their deals with Bismarck must mean something to every person who does not treat history like Gogol's Petrushka¹¹⁶—when the bourgeoisie are summoning foreign states to their aid and intriguing with them against the revolution, is simply comical. The revolutionary proletariat is to put on a nightcap, like "Muddle-headed Counsellor" Kautsky, and regard the bourgeoisie, who are organising Dutov, Krasnov and Czech counter-revolutionary insurrections and are paying millions to saboteurs, as a legal "opposition". Oh, what profundity!

Kautsky is exclusively interested in the formal, legal aspect of the question, and, reading his disquisitions on the Soviet Constitution, one involuntarily recalls Bebel's words: Lawyers are thoroughbred reactionaries. "In reality," Kautsky writes, "the capitalists alone cannot be disfranchised. What is a capitalist in the legal sense of the term? A property-owner? Even in a country which has advanced so far along the path of economic progress as Germany, where the proletariat is so numerous, the establishment of a Soviet republic would disfranchise a large mass of people. In 1907, the number of persons in the German Empire engaged in the three great occupational groups—agriculture, industry and commerce—together with their families amounted roughly to thirty-five million in the wage-earners' and salaried employees' group, and seventeen million in the independent group. Hence, a party might well form a majority among the wage-workers but a minority among the population as a whole" (p. 33).

That is an example of Kautsky's mode of argument. Isn't it the counter-revolutionary whining of a bourgeois?

Why, Mr. Kautsky, have you relegated all the "independents" to the category of the disfranchised, when you know very well that the overwhelming majority of the Russian peasants do not employ hired labour, and do not, therefore, lose their franchise? Isn't this falsification?

Why, learned economist, did you not quote the facts with which you are perfectly familiar and which are to be found in those same German statistical returns for 1907 relating to hired labour in agriculture according to size of farms? Why did you not quote these facts to enable the German workers, the readers of your pamphlet, to see *how many exploiters there are*, and how few they are compared with the total number of "farmers" who figure in German statistics?

You did not because your apostasy has made you a mere sycophant of the bourgeoisie.

The term capitalist, Kautsky argues, is legally a vague concept, and on several pages he thunders against the "arbitrariness" of the Soviet Constitution. This "serious scholar" has no objection to the British bourgeoisie taking several centuries to work out and develop a new (new for the Middle Ages) bourgeois constitution, but, representative of lackey's science that he is, he will allow no time to us, the workers and peasants of Russia. He expects us to have a constitution all worked out to the very last letter in a few months....

"Arbitrariness!" Just imagine what a depth of vile subservience to the bourgeoisie and most inept pedantry is contained in *such a reproach*. When thoroughly bourgeois and for the most part reactionary lawyers in the capitalist countries have for centuries or decades been drawing up most detailed rules and regulations and writing scores and hundreds of volumes of laws and interpretations of laws to *oppress* the workers, to bind the *poor man* hand and foot and to place thousands of hindrances and obstacles in the way of any of the common labouring people—there the bourgeois liberals and Mr. Kautsky see no "arbitrariness"! That is "law" and "order"! The ways in which the poor are to be "kept down" have all been thought out and written down. There are thousands of bourgeois lawyers and bureaucrats (about them Kautsky says nothing at all, probably just

because Marx attached enormous significance to *smashing* the bureaucratic machine...)—lawyers and bureaucrats who know how to interpret the laws in such a way that the worker and the average peasant can never break through the barbed-wire entanglements of these laws. This is not “arbitrariness” on the part of the bourgeoisie, it is not the dictatorship of the sordid and self-seeking exploiters who are sucking the blood of the people. Nothing of the kind! It is “pure democracy”, which is becoming purer and purer every day.

But now that the toiling and exploited classes, while cut off by the imperialist war from their brothers across the border, have for the first time in history set up their own Soviets, have called to the work of political construction *those people* whom the bourgeoisie used to oppress, grind down and stupefy, and have begun *themselves* to build a *new*, proletarian state, have begun in the heat of furious struggle, in the fire of civil war, to sketch the fundamental principles of a state *without exploiters*—all the bourgeois scoundrels, the whole gang of bloodsuckers, with Kautsky echoing them, howl about “arbitrariness”! Indeed, how will these ignorant people, these workers and peasants, this “mob”, be able to interpret their laws? How can these common labourers acquire a sense of justice without the counsel of educated lawyers, of bourgeois writers, of the Kautskys and the wise old bureaucrats?

Mr. Kautsky quotes from my speech of April 28, 1918, the words: “The people themselves determine the procedure and the time of elections.” And Kautsky, the “pure democrat”, infers from this:

“...Hence, it would mean that every assembly of electors may determine the procedure of elections at their own discretion. Arbitrariness and the opportunity of getting rid of undesirable opposition in the ranks of the proletariat itself would thus be carried to the extreme” (p. 37).

Well, how does this differ from the talk of a hack hired by capitalists, who howls about the people oppressing industrious workers who are “willing to work” during a strike? Why is the *bourgeois* bureaucratic method of determining electoral procedure under “pure” bourgeois democracy *not* arbitrariness? Why should the sense of justice *among the masses who have risen to fight* their age-old exploiters and

who are being educated and steeled in this desperate struggle be less than that of a *handful* of bureaucrats, intellectuals and lawyers brought up in *bourgeois* prejudices?

Kautsky is a true socialist. Don't dare suspect the sincerity of this very respectable father of a family, of this very honest citizen. He is an ardent and convinced supporter of the victory of the workers, of the proletarian revolution. All he wants is that the honey-mouthing, petty-bourgeois intellectuals and philistines in nightcaps should *first—before* the masses begin to move, *before* they start a furious battle with the exploiters, and certainly *without* civil war—draw up a moderate and precise *set of rules for the development of the revolution....*

Burning with profound moral indignation, our most learned Judas Golovlyov¹¹⁷ tells the German workers that on June 14, 1918, the All-Russia Central Executive Committee of Soviets resolved to expel the representatives of the Right Socialist-Revolutionary Party and the Mensheviks from the Soviets. "This measure," writes Judas Kautsky, all afire with noble indignation, "is not directed against definite persons guilty of definite punishable offences.... The Constitution of the Soviet Republic does not contain a single word about the immunity of Soviet deputies. It is not definite *persons*, but definite *parties* that are expelled from the Soviets" (p. 37).

Yes, that is really awful, an intolerable departure from pure democracy, according to the rules of which our revolutionary Judas Kautsky will make the revolution. We Russian Bolsheviks should first have guaranteed immunity to the Savinkovs and Co., to the Lieberdans,¹¹⁸ Potresovs ("activists"¹¹⁹) and Co., then drawn up a criminal code proclaiming participation in the Czech counter-revolutionary war, or in the alliance with the German imperialists in the Ukraine or in Georgia *against* the workers of one's own country, to be "punishable offences", and *only then*, on the basis of this criminal code, would we be entitled, in accordance with the principles of "pure democracy", to expel "definite persons" from the Soviets. It goes without saying that the Czechs, who are subsidised by the British and French capitalists through the medium (or thanks to the agitation) of the Savinkovs, Potresovs and Lieberdans, and

the Krasnovs who receive ammunition from the Germans through the medium of the Ukrainian and Tiflis Mensheviks, would have sat quietly waiting until we were ready with our proper criminal code, and, like the purest democrats they are, would have confined themselves to the role of an "opposition"....

No less profound moral indignation is aroused in Kautsky's breast by the fact that the Soviet Constitution disfranchises all those who "employ hired labour with a view to profit". "A home-worker, or a small master employing only one journeyman," Kautsky writes, "may live and feel quite like a proletarian, but he has no vote" (p. 36).

What a departure from "pure democracy"! What an injustice! True, up to now all Marxists have thought—and thousands of facts have proved it—that the small masters were the most unscrupulous and grasping exploiters of hired labour, but our Judas Kautsky takes the small masters not as a *class* (who invented that pernicious theory of the class struggle?) but as single individuals, exploiters who "live and feel quite like proletarians". The famous "thrifty Agnes", who was considered dead and buried long ago, has come to life again under Kautsky's pen. This "thrifty Agnes" was invented and launched into German literature some decades ago by that "pure" democrat, the bourgeois Eugen Richter. He predicted untold calamities that would follow the dictatorship of the proletariat, the confiscation of the capital of the exploiters, and asked with an innocent air: What is a capitalist in the legal sense of the term? He took as an example a poor, thrifty seamstress ("thrifty Agnes"), whom the wicked "proletarian dictators" rob of her last farthing. There was a time when all German Social-Democrats used to poke fun at this "thrifty Agnes" of the pure democrat, Eugen Richter. But that was a long, long time ago, when Bebel, who was quite frank and open about there being many national-liberals²⁰ in his party, was still alive; that was very long ago, when Kautsky was not yet a renegade.

Now "thrifty Agnes" has come to life again in the person of the "small master who employs only one journeyman and who lives and feels quite like a proletarian". The wicked Bolsheviks are wronging him, depriving him of his vote.

It is true that "every assembly of electors" in the Soviet Republic, as Kautsky tells us, may admit into its midst a poor little master who, for instance, may be connected with this or that factory, if, by way of an exception, he is not an exploiter, and if he *really* "lives and feels quite like a proletarian". But can one rely on the knowledge of life, on the sense of justice of an irregular factory meeting of common workers acting (how awful!) without a written code? Would it not clearly be better to grant the vote to *all* exploiters, to *all* who employ hired labour, rather than risk the possibility of "thrifty Agnes" and the "small master who lives and feels quite like a proletarian" being wronged by the workers?

* * *

Let the contemptible renegade scoundrels, amidst the applause of the bourgeoisie and the social-chauvinists,* abuse our Soviet Constitution for disfranchising the exploiters! That's fine because it will accelerate and widen the split between the revolutionary workers of Europe and the Scheidemanns and Kautskys, the Renaudels and Longuets, the Hendersons and Ramsay MacDonalds, the old leaders and old betrayers of socialism.

The mass of the oppressed classes, the class-conscious and honest revolutionary proletarian leaders will be *on our side*. It will be enough to acquaint such proletarians and such people with our Soviet Constitution for them to say at once: "These are really *our people*, this is a real workers' party, this is a real workers' government, for it does not deceive the workers by talking about reforms in the way *all the above-mentioned leaders have done*, but is fighting the exploiters in real earnest, making a revolution in real earnest and *actually* fighting for the complete emancipation of the workers."

The *fact* that after a year's "experience" the Soviets

* I have just read a leading article in *Frankfurter Zeitung*¹²¹ (No. 293, October 22, 1918), giving an enthusiastic summary of Kautsky's pamphlet. This organ of the stock exchange is satisfied. And no wonder! And a comrade writes to me from Berlin that *Vorwärts*,¹²² the organ of the Scheidemanns, has declared in a special article that it subscribes to almost every line Kautsky has written. Hearty congratulations!

have deprived the exploiters of the franchise *shows* that the Soviets are really organisations of the oppressed and not of social-imperialists and social-pacifists who have sold themselves to the bourgeoisie. The *fact* that the Soviets have disfranchised the exploiters *shows* they are not organs of petty-bourgeois compromise with the capitalists, not organs of parliamentary chatter (on the part of the Kautskys, the Longuets and the MacDonalds), but organs of the genuinely revolutionary proletariat which is waging a life-and-death struggle against the exploiters.

"Kautsky's book is almost unknown here," a well-informed comrade wrote to me from Berlin a few days ago (today is October 30). I would advise our ambassadors in Germany and Switzerland not to stint thousands in buying up this book and *distributing it gratis* among the class-conscious workers so as to trample in the mud this "European"—read: imperialist and reformist—Social-Democracy, which has long been a "stinking corpse".

* * *

At the end of his book, on pages 61 and 63, Mr. Kautsky bitterly laments the fact that the "new theory" (as he calls Bolshevism, fearing to touch Marx's and Engels's analysis of the Paris Commune) "finds supporters even in old democracies like Switzerland, for instance". "It is incomprehensible" to Kautsky "how this theory can be adopted by German Social-Democrats".

No, it is quite comprehensible; for after the serious lessons of the war the revolutionary masses are becoming sick and tired of the Scheidemanns and the Kautskys.

"We" have always been in favour of democracy, Kautsky writes, yet we are supposed suddenly to renounce it!

"We", the opportunists of Social-Democracy, have always been opposed to the dictatorship of the proletariat, and Kolb and Co. proclaimed this *long ago*. Kautsky knows this and vainly expects that he will be able to conceal from his readers the obvious fact that he has "returned to the fold" of the Bernsteins and Kolbs.

"We", the revolutionary Marxists, have never made a fetish of "pure" (bourgeois) democracy. As is known, in 1903 Plekhanov was a revolutionary Marxist (later his

unfortunate turn brought him to the position of a Russian Scheidemann). And in that year Plekhanov declared at our Party Congress, which was then adopting its programme, that in the revolution the proletariat would, if necessary, disfranchise the capitalists and *disperse any parliament* that was found to be counter-revolutionary. That this is the only view that corresponds to Marxism will be clear to anybody even from the statements of Marx and Engels which I have quoted above; it patently follows from all the fundamental principles of Marxism.

“We”, the revolutionary Marxists, never made speeches to the people that the Kautskyites of all nations love to make, cringing before the bourgeoisie, adapting themselves to the bourgeois parliamentary system, keeping silent about the *bourgeois* character of modern democracy and demanding only *its* extension, only that *it* be carried to its logical conclusion.

“We” said to the bourgeoisie: You, exploiters and hypocrites, talk about democracy, while at every step you erect thousands of barriers to prevent the *oppressed people* from taking part in politics. We take you at your word and, in the interests of these people, demand the extension of *your* bourgeois democracy *in order to prepare the people for revolution* for the purpose of overthrowing you, the exploiters. And if you exploiters attempt to offer resistance to our proletarian revolution we shall ruthlessly suppress you; we shall deprive you of all rights; more than that, we shall not give you any bread, for in our proletarian republic the exploiters will have no rights, they will be deprived of fire and water, for we are socialists in real earnest, and not in the Scheidemann or Kautsky fashion.

That is what “we”, the revolutionary Marxists, said, and will say—and that is why the oppressed people will support us and be with us, while the Scheidemanns and the Kautskys will be swept into the renegades’ cesspool.

WHAT IS INTERNATIONALISM?

Kautsky is absolutely convinced that he is an internationalist and calls himself one. The Scheidemanns he calls “government socialists”. In defending the Mensheviks (he

does not openly express his solidarity with them, but he faithfully expresses their views), Kautsky has shown with perfect clarity what kind of "internationalism" he subscribes to. And since Kautsky is not alone, but is spokesman for a trend which inevitably grew up in the atmosphere of the Second International (Longuet in France, Turati in Italy, Nobs and Grimm, Graber and Naine in Switzerland, Ramsay MacDonald in Britain, etc.), it will be instructive to dwell on Kautsky's "internationalism".

After emphasising that the Mensheviks also attended the Zimmerwald Conference (a diploma, certainly, but ... a tainted one), Kautsky sets forth the views of the Mensheviks, with whom he agrees, in the following manner:

"... The Mensheviks wanted a general peace. They wanted all the belligerents to adopt the formula: no annexations and no indemnities. Until this had been achieved, the Russian army, according to this view, was to stand ready for battle. The Bolsheviks, on the other hand, demanded an immediate peace at any price; they were prepared, if need be, to make a separate peace; they tried to force it by increasing the state of disorganisation of the army, which was already bad enough" (p. 27). In Kautsky's opinion the Bolsheviks should not have taken power, and should have contented themselves with a Constituent Assembly.

So, the internationalism of Kautsky and the Mensheviks amounts to this: to demand reforms from the imperialist bourgeois government, but to continue to support it, and to continue to support the war that this government is waging until everyone in the war has accepted the formula: no annexations and no indemnities. This view was repeatedly expressed by Turati, and by the Kautsky supporters (Haase and others), and by Longuet and Co., who declared that they stood *for* defence of the fatherland.

Theoretically, this shows a complete inability to dissociate oneself from the social-chauvinists and complete confusion on the question of defence of the fatherland. Politically, it means substituting petty-bourgeois nationalism for internationalism, deserting to the reformists' camp and renouncing revolution.

From the point of view of the proletariat, recognising "defence of the fatherland" means justifying the present

war, admitting that it is legitimate. And since the war remains an imperialist war (both under a monarchy and under a republic), irrespective of the country—mine or some other country—in which the enemy troops are stationed at the given moment, recognising defence of the fatherland means, *in fact*, supporting the imperialist, predatory bourgeoisie, and completely betraying socialism. In Russia, even under Kerensky, under the bourgeois-democratic republic, the war continued to be an imperialist war, for it was being waged by the bourgeoisie as a ruling class (and war is a “continuation of politics”); and a particularly striking expression of the imperialist character of the war were the secret treaties for the partitioning of the world and the plunder of other countries which had been concluded by the tsar at the time with the capitalists of Britain and France.

The Mensheviks deceived the people in a most despicable manner by calling this war a defensive or revolutionary war. And by approving the policy of the Mensheviks, Kautsky is approving the popular deception, is approving the part played by the petty bourgeoisie in helping capital to trick the workers and harness them to the chariot of the imperialists. Kautsky is pursuing a characteristically petty-bourgeois, philistine policy by pretending (and trying to make the people believe the absurd idea) that *putting forward a slogan* alters the position. The entire history of bourgeois democracy refutes this illusion; the bourgeois democrats have always advanced all sorts of “slogans” to deceive the people. The point is to *test* their sincerity, to compare their words with their *deeds*, not to be satisfied with idealistic or charlatan *phrases*, but to get down to *class reality*. An imperialist war does not cease to be imperialist when charlatans or phrase-mongers or petty-bourgeois philistines put forward sentimental “slogans”, but only when the *class* which is conducting the imperialist war, and is bound to it by millions of economic threads (and even ropes), is really *overthrown* and is replaced at the helm of state by the really revolutionary class, the proletariat. *There is no other way of getting out of an imperialist war, as also out of an imperialist predatory peace.*

By approving the foreign policy of the Mensheviks, and by declaring it to be internationalist and Zimmerwaldist,

Kautsky, first, reveals the utter rottenness of the opportunist Zimmerwald majority (no wonder we, the *Left* Zimmerwaldists,¹²⁸ at once dissociated ourselves from such a majority!), and, secondly—and this is the chief thing—passes from the position of the proletariat to the position of the petty bourgeoisie, from the revolutionary to the reformist.

The proletariat fights for the revolutionary overthrow of the imperialist bourgeoisie; the petty bourgeoisie fights for the reformist "improvement" of imperialism, for adaptation to it, while *submitting* to it. When Kautsky was still a Marxist, for example, in 1909, when he wrote his *Road to Power*, it was the idea that war would inevitably lead to revolution that he advocated, and he spoke of the approach of an *era of revolutions*. The Basle Manifesto of 1912 plainly and definitely speaks of a *proletarian revolution* in connection with that very imperialist war between the German and the British groups which actually broke out in 1914. But in 1918, when revolutions did begin in connection with the war, Kautsky, instead of explaining that they were inevitable, instead of pondering over and thinking out the *revolutionary* tactics and the ways and means of preparing for revolution, began to describe the reformist tactics of the Mensheviks as internationalism. Isn't this apostasy?

Kautsky praises the Mensheviks for having insisted on maintaining the fighting strength of the army, and he blames the Bolsheviks for having added to "disorganisation of the army", which was already disorganised enough as it was. This means praising reformism and submission to the imperialist bourgeoisie, and blaming and renouncing revolution. For under Kerensky maintaining the fighting strength of the army meant its preservation under *bourgeois* (albeit republican) command. Everybody knows, and the progress of events has strikingly confirmed it, that this republican army preserved the *Kornilov* spirit because its officers were *Kornilov* men. The bourgeois officers could not help being *Kornilov* men; they could not help gravitating towards imperialism and towards the forcible suppression of the proletariat. All that the Menshevik tactics amounted to in practice was to leave all the foundations of

the imperialist war and all the foundations of the *bourgeois* dictatorship intact, to patch up details and to daub over a few trifles ("reforms").

On the other hand, not a single great revolution has ever taken place, or ever can take place, without the "disorganisation" of the army. For the army is the most ossified instrument for supporting the old regime, the most hardened bulwark of bourgeois discipline, buttressing up the rule of capital, and preserving and fostering among the working people the servile spirit of submission and subjection to capital. Counter-revolution has never tolerated, and never could tolerate, armed workers side by side with the army. In France, Engels wrote, the workers emerged armed from every revolution: "therefore, the disarming of the workers was the first commandment for the bourgeoisie, who were at the helm of the state."¹²⁴ The armed workers were the embryo of a *new* army, the organised nucleus of a *new* social order. The first commandment of the bourgeoisie was to crush this nucleus and prevent it from growing. The first commandment of every victorious revolution, as Marx and Engels repeatedly emphasised, was to smash the old army, dissolve it and replace it by a new one.¹²⁵ A new social class, when rising to power, never could, and cannot now, attain power and consolidate it except by completely disintegrating the old army ("Disorganisation!" the reactionary or just cowardly philistines howl on this score), except by passing through a most difficult and painful period without any army (the great French Revolution also passed through such a painful period), and by gradually building up, in the midst of hard civil war, a new army, a new discipline, a new military organisation of the new class. Formerly, Kautsky the historian understood this. Now, Kautsky the renegade has forgotten it.

What right has Kautsky to call the Scheidemanns "government socialists" if he *approves* of the tactics of the Mensheviks in the Russian revolution? In supporting Kerensky and joining his Ministry, the Mensheviks were also government socialists. Kautsky could not escape this conclusion if he were to put the question as to which is the *ruling class* that is waging the imperialist war. But Kautsky avoids raising the question about the ruling class, a question that

is imperative for a Marxist, for the mere raising of it would expose the renegade.

The Kautsky supporters in Germany, the Longuet supporters in France, and Turati and Co. in Italy argue in this way: socialism presupposes the equality and freedom of nations, their self-determination, *hence*, when our country is attacked, or when enemy troops invade our territory, it is the right and duty of socialists to defend their country. But theoretically such an argument is either a sheer mockery of socialism or a fraudulent subterfuge, while from the point of view of practical politics it coincides with the argument of the quite ignorant country yokel who has even no conception of the social, class character of the war, and of the tasks of a revolutionary party during a reactionary war.

Socialism is opposed to violence against nations. That is indisputable. But socialism is opposed to violence against men in general. Apart from Christian anarchists and Tolstoians, however, no one has yet drawn the conclusion from this that socialism is opposed to *revolutionary* violence. So, to talk about "violence" in general, without examining the conditions which distinguish reactionary from revolutionary violence, means being a philistine who renounces revolution, or else it means simply deceiving oneself and others by sophistry.

The same holds true of violence against nations. Every war is violence against nations, but that does not prevent socialists from being *in favour* of a revolutionary war. The class character of war—that is the fundamental question which confronts a socialist (if he is not a renegade). The imperialist war of 1914-18 is a war between two groups of the imperialist bourgeoisie for the division of the world, for the division of the booty, and for the plunder and strangleulation of small and weak nations. This was the appraisal of the impending war given in the Basle Manifesto in 1912, and it has been confirmed by the facts. Whoever departs from this view of war is not a socialist.

If a German under Wilhelm or a Frenchman under Clemenceau says, "It is my right and duty as a socialist to defend my country if it is invaded by an enemy", he argues not like a socialist, not like an internationalist, not like a revolutionary proletarian, but like a *petty-bourgeois*

nationalist. Because this argument ignores the revolutionary class struggle of the workers against capital, it ignores the appraisal of the war as a *whole* from the point of view of the world bourgeoisie and the world proletariat, that is, it ignores internationalism, and all that remains is miserable and narrow-minded nationalism. My country is being wronged, that is all I care about—that is what this argument amounts to, and that is where its petty-bourgeois, nationalist narrow-mindedness lies. It is the same as if in regard to individual violence, violence against an individual, one were to argue that socialism is opposed to violence and therefore I would rather be a traitor than go to prison.

The Frenchman, German or Italian who says: "Socialism is opposed to violence against nations, therefore I defend myself when my country is invaded", betrays socialism and internationalism, because such a man *sees only* his own "country", he puts "his own" ... bourgeoisie above everything else and does not give a thought to the *international connections* which make the war an imperialist war and *his* bourgeoisie a link in the chain of imperialist plunder.

All philistines and all stupid and ignorant yokels argue in the same way as the renegade Kautsky supporters, Longuet supporters, Turati and Co.: "The enemy has invaded my country, I don't care about anything else."*

The socialist, the revolutionary proletarian, the internationalist, argues differently. He says: "The character of the war (whether it is reactionary or revolutionary) does not depend on who the attacker was, or in whose country the 'enemy' is stationed; it depends on *what class* is waging the war, and on what politics this war is a continuation of. If the war is a reactionary, imperialist war, that is, if it

* The social-chauvinists (the Scheidemanns, Renaudels, Hendersons, Gomperses and Co.) absolutely refuse to talk about the "International" during the war. They regard the enemies of "*their*" respective bourgeoisies as "traitors" to ... socialism. They *support* the policy of conquest pursued by *their* respective bourgeoisies. The social-pacifists (i.e., socialists in words and petty-bourgeois pacifists in practice) express all sorts of "internationalist" sentiments, protest against annexations, etc., but in *practice* they continue to *support* *their* respective imperialist bourgeoisies. The difference between the two types is unimportant; it is like the difference between two capitalists—one with bitter, and the other with sweet, words on his lips.

is being waged by two world groups of the imperialist, rapacious, predatory, reactionary bourgeoisie, then every bourgeoisie (even of the smallest country) becomes a participant in the plunder, and my duty as a representative of the revolutionary proletariat is to prepare for the *world proletarian revolution* as the *only* escape from the horrors of a world slaughter. I must argue, not from the point of view of 'my' country (for that is the argument of a wretched, stupid, petty-bourgeois nationalist who does not realise that he is only a plaything in the hands of the imperialist bourgeoisie), but from the point of view of *my share* in the preparation, in the propaganda, and in the acceleration of the world proletarian revolution."

That is what internationalism means, and that is the duty of the internationalist, the revolutionary worker, the genuine socialist. That is the *ABC* that Kautsky the renegade has "forgotten". And his apostasy becomes still more obvious when he passes from approving the tactics of the petty-bourgeois nationalists (the Mensheviks in Russia, the Longuet supporters in France, the Turatis in Italy, and Haase and Co. in Germany) to criticising the Bolshevik tactics. Here is his criticism:

"The Bolshevik revolution was based on the assumption that it would become the starting-point of a general European revolution, that the bold initiative of Russia would prompt the proletarians of all Europe to rise.

"On this assumption it was, of course, immaterial what forms the Russian separate peace would take, what hardships and territorial losses (literally: mutilation or maiming, *Verstümmelungen*) it would cause the Russian people, and what interpretation of the self-determination of nations it would give. At that time it was also immaterial whether Russia was able to defend herself or not. According to this view, the European revolution would be the best protection of the Russian revolution, and would bring complete and genuine self-determination to all peoples inhabiting the former Russian territory.

"A revolution in Europe, which would establish and consolidate socialism there, would also become the means of removing the obstacles that would arise in Russia in the way of the introduction of the socialist system of production owing to the economic backwardness of the country.

"All this was very logical and very sound—only if the main assumption were granted, namely, that the Russian revolution would infallibly let loose a European revolution. But what if that did not happen?

"So far the assumption has not been justified. And the proletarians of Europe are now being accused of having abandoned and betrayed

the Russian revolution. This is an accusation levelled against unknown persons, for who is to be held responsible for the behaviour of the European proletariat?" (P. 28.)

And Kautsky then goes on to explain at great length that Marx, Engels and Bebel were more than once mistaken about the advent of revolution they had anticipated, but that they never based their tactics on the expectation of a revolution "*at a definite date*" (p. 29), whereas, he says, the Bolsheviks "staked everything on one card, on a general European revolution".

We have deliberately quoted this long passage to demonstrate to our readers Kautsky's "skill" in counterfeiting Marxism by palming off his banal and reactionary philistine view in its stead.

First, to ascribe to an opponent an obviously stupid idea and then to refute it is a trick practised by none too clever people. If the Bolsheviks had based their tactics on the expectation of a revolution in other countries *by a definite date* that would have been an undeniable stupidity. But the Bolshevik Party has never been guilty of such stupidity. In my letter to American workers (August 20, 1918), I expressly disown this foolish idea by saying that we count on an American revolution, but not by any definite date. I dwelt at length upon the very same idea more than once in my controversy with the Left Socialist-Revolutionaries and the "Left Communists" (January-March 1918). Kautsky has committed a slight... just a very slight forgery, on which he in fact based his criticism of Bolshevism. Kautsky has confused tactics based on the expectation of a European revolution in the more or less near future, but not at a definite date, with tactics based on the expectation of a European revolution at a definite date. A slight, just a very slight forgery!

The last-named tactics are foolish. The first-named are *obligatory* for a Marxist, for every revolutionary proletarian and internationalist—*obligatory*, because they alone take into account in a proper Marxist way the objective situation brought about by the war in all European countries, and they alone conform to the international tasks of the proletariat.

By substituting the petty question about an error which

the Bolshevik revolutionaries might have made, but did not, for the important question of the foundations of revolutionary tactics in general, Kautsky adroitly abjures all revolutionary tactics!

A renegade in politics, he is *unable even to present the question* of the objective prerequisites of revolutionary tactics theoretically.

And this brings us to the second point.

Secondly, it is obligatory for a Marxist to count on a European revolution if a *revolutionary situation* exists. It is the *ABC* of Marxism that the tactics of the socialist proletariat cannot be the same both when there is a revolutionary situation and when there is no revolutionary situation.

If Kautsky had put this question, which is obligatory for a Marxist, he would have seen that the answer was absolutely against him. Long before the war, all Marxists, all socialists were agreed that a European war would create a revolutionary situation. Kautsky himself, before he became a renegade, clearly and definitely recognised this—in 1902 (in his *Social Revolution*) and in 1909 (in his *Road to Power*). It was also admitted in the name of the entire Second International in the Basle Manifesto. No wonder the social-chauvinists and Kautsky supporters (the “Centrists”, i. e., those who waver between the revolutionaries and the opportunists) of all countries shun like the plague the declarations of the Basle Manifesto on this score!

So, the expectation of a revolutionary situation in Europe was not an infatuation of the Bolsheviks, but the *general opinion* of all Marxists. When Kautsky tries to escape from this indisputable truth using such phrases as the Bolsheviks “always believed in the omnipotence of violence and will”, he simply utters a sonorous and empty phrase to *cover up* his evasion, a shameful evasion, to put the question of a revolutionary situation.

To proceed. Has a revolutionary situation actually come or not? Kautsky proved unable to put this question either. The economic facts provide an answer: the famine and ruin created everywhere by the war imply a revolutionary situation. The political facts also provide an answer: ever since 1915 a splitting process has been evident in *all* countries within the old and decayed socialist parties, a process

of *departure of the mass* of the proletariat from the social-chauvinist leaders to the left, to revolutionary ideas and sentiments, to revolutionary leaders.

Only a person who dreads revolution and betrays it could have failed to see these facts on August 5, 1918, when Kautsky was writing his pamphlet. And now, at the end of October 1918, the revolution is growing *in a number* of European countries, and growing under everybody's eyes and very rapidly at that. Kautsky the "revolutionary", who still wants to be regarded as a Marxist, has proved to be a short-sighted philistine, who, like those philistines of 1847 whom Marx ridiculed, failed to see the approaching revolution!

Now to the third point.

Thirdly, what should be the specific features of revolutionary tactics when there is a revolutionary situation in Europe? Having become a renegade, Kautsky feared to put this question, which is obligatory for a Marxist. Kautsky argues like a typical petty bourgeois, a philistine, or like an ignorant peasant: has a "general European revolution" begun or not? If it has, then *he too* is prepared to become a revolutionary! But then, mark you, every scoundrel (like the scoundrels who now sometimes attach themselves to the victorious Bolsheviks) would proclaim himself a revolutionary!

If it has not, then Kautsky will turn his back on revolution! Kautsky does not display a shade of understanding of the truth that a revolutionary Marxist differs from the philistine and petty bourgeois by his ability to *preach* to the uneducated masses that the maturing revolution is necessary, to *prove* that it is inevitable, to *explain* its benefits to the people, and to *prepare* the proletariat and all the working and exploited people for it.

Kautsky ascribed to the Bolsheviks an absurdity, namely, that they had staked everything on one card, on a European revolution breaking out at a definite date. This absurdity has turned against Kautsky himself, because the logical conclusion of his argument is that the tactics of the Bolsheviks would have been correct if a European revolution had broken out by August 5, 1918! That is the date Kautsky mentions as the time he was writing his pamphlet. And

when, a few weeks after this August 5, it became clear that revolution was coming in a number of European countries, the whole apostasy of Kautsky, his whole falsification of Marxism, and his utter inability to reason or even to present questions in a revolutionary manner, became revealed in all their charm!

When the proletarians of Europe are accused of treachery, Kautsky writes, it is an accusation levelled at unknown persons.

You are mistaken, Mr. Kautsky! Look in the mirror and you will see those "unknown persons" against whom this accusation is levelled. Kautsky assumes an air of naïveté and pretends not to understand *who* levelled the accusation, and its *meaning*. In reality, however, Kautsky knows perfectly well that the accusation has been and is being levelled by the German "Lefts", by the Spartacists,¹²⁶ by Liebknecht and his friends. This accusation expresses a *clear appreciation* of the fact that the German proletariat betrayed the Russian (and world) revolution when it strangled Finland, the Ukraine, Latvia and Estonia. This accusation is levelled primarily and above all, not against the *masses*, who are always downtrodden, but against those *leaders* who, like the Scheidemanns and the Kautskys, *failed* in their duty to carry on revolutionary agitation, revolutionary propaganda, revolutionary work among the masses to overcome their inertness, who in fact worked *against* the revolutionary instincts and aspirations which are always aglow deep down among the mass of the oppressed class. The Scheidemanns bluntly, crudely, cynically, and in most cases for selfish motives betrayed the proletariat and deserted to the side of the bourgeoisie. The Kautsky and the Longuet supporters did the same thing, only hesitatingly and haltingly, and casting cowardly side-glances at those who were stronger at the moment. In all his writings during the war Kautsky tried to *extinguish* the revolutionary spirit instead of fostering and fanning it.

The fact that Kautsky does not even understand the enormous *theoretical* importance, and the even greater agitational and propaganda importance, of the "accusation" that the proletarians of Europe have betrayed the Russian revolution will remain a veritable historical monument to

the philistine stupefaction of the "average" leader of German official Social-Democracy! Kautsky does not understand that, owing to the censorship prevailing in the German "Reich", this "accusation" is perhaps the only form in which the German socialists who have not betrayed socialism—Liebknecht and his friends—can express *their appeal to the German workers* to throw off the Scheidemanns and the Kautskys, to push aside such "leaders", to free themselves from their stultifying and debasing propaganda, to rise in revolt *in spite of them, without them, and march over their heads towards revolution!*

Kautsky does not understand this. And how could he understand the tactics of the Bolsheviks? Can a man who renounces revolution in general be expected to weigh and appraise the conditions of the development of revolution in one of the most "difficult" cases?

The Bolsheviks' tactics were correct; they were the *only* internationalist tactics, because they were based, not on the cowardly fear of a world revolution, not on a philistine "lack of faith" in it, not on the narrow nationalist desire to protect one's "own" fatherland (the fatherland of one's own bourgeoisie), while not "giving a damn" about all the rest, but on a correct (and, before the war and before the apostasy of the social-chauvinists and social-pacifists, a universally accepted) *estimation* of the revolutionary situation in Europe. These tactics were the only internationalist tactics, because they did the utmost possible in one country *for* the development, support and awakening of the revolution *in all countries*. These tactics have been justified by their enormous success, for Bolshevism (not by any means because of the merits of the Russian Bolsheviks, but because of the most profound sympathy of the *people* everywhere for tactics that are revolutionary in practice) has become *world* Bolshevism, has produced an idea, a theory, a programme and tactics which differ concretely and in practice from those of social-chauvinism and social-pacifism. Bolshevism *has given a coup de grâce* to the old, decayed International of the Scheidemanns and Kautskys, Renaudels and Longuets, Hendersons and MacDonalds, who from now on will be treading on each other's feet, dreaming about "unity" and trying to revive a corpse. Bolshevism *has created* the ideological

and tactical foundations of a Third International, of a really proletarian and Communist International, which will take into consideration both the gains of the tranquil epoch and the experience of the *epoch of revolutions, which has begun.*

Bolshevism has popularised throughout the world the idea of the "dictatorship of the proletariat", has translated these words from the Latin, first into Russian, and then into all the languages of the world, and has shown by the example of *Soviet government* that the workers and poor peasants, even of a backward country, even with the least experience, education and habits of organisation, *have been able* for a whole year, amidst gigantic difficulties and amidst a struggle against the exploiters (who were supported by the bourgeoisie of the *whole world*), to maintain the power of the working people, to create a democracy that is immeasurably higher and broader than all previous democracies in the world, and to *start* the creative work of tens of millions of workers and peasants for the practical construction of socialism.

Bolshevism has actually helped to develop the proletarian revolution in Europe and America more powerfully than any party in any other country has so far succeeded in doing. While the workers of the whole world are realising more and more clearly every day that the tactics of the Scheidemanns and Kautskys have not delivered them from the imperialist war and from wage-slavery to the imperialist bourgeoisie, and that these tactics cannot serve as a model for all countries, the mass of workers in all countries are realising more and more clearly every day that Bolshevism has indicated the right road of escape from the horrors of war and imperialism, that Bolshevism *can serve as a model of tactics for all.*

Not only the general European, but the world proletarian revolution is maturing before the eyes of all, and it has been assisted, accelerated and supported by the victory of the proletariat in Russia. All this is not enough for the complete victory of socialism, you say? Of course it is not enough. One country alone cannot do more. But this one country, thanks to *Soviet government*, has done so much that even if *Soviet government* in Russia were to be crushed by world

imperialism tomorrow, as a result, let us say, of an agreement between German and Anglo-French imperialism—even granted that very worst possibility—it would still be found that Bolshevik tactics have brought enormous benefit to socialism and have assisted the growth of the invincible world revolution.

SUBSERVIENCE TO THE BOURGEOISIE IN THE GUISE OF "ECONOMIC ANALYSIS"

As has already been said, if the title of Kautsky's book were properly to reflect its contents, it should have been called, not *The Dictatorship of the Proletariat*, but *A Rehash of Bourgeois Attacks on the Bolsheviks*.

The old Menshevik "theories" about the bourgeois character of the Russian revolution, i.e., the old distortion of Marxism by the Mensheviks (*rejected* by Kautsky in 1905!), are now once again being rehashed by our theoretician. We must deal with this question, however boring it may be for Russian Marxists.

The Russian revolution is a bourgeois revolution, said all the Marxists of Russia before 1905. The Mensheviks, substituting liberalism for Marxism, drew the following conclusion from this: the proletariat therefore must not go beyond what is acceptable to the bourgeoisie and must pursue a policy of compromise with them. The Bolsheviks said this was a bourgeois-liberal theory. The bourgeoisie were trying to bring about the reform of the state on bourgeois, *reformist*, not revolutionary lines, while preserving the monarchy, the landlord system, etc., as far as possible. The proletariat must carry through the bourgeois-democratic revolution to the end, not allowing itself to be "bound" by the reformism of the bourgeoisie. The Bolsheviks formulated the alignment of *class* forces in the bourgeois revolution as follows: the proletariat, winning over the peasants, will neutralise the liberal bourgeoisie and utterly destroy the monarchy, medievalism and the landlord system.

It is the alliance between the proletariat and the peasants *in general* that reveals the bourgeois character of the revolution, for the peasants in general are small producers who exist on the basis of commodity production. Further, the

Bolsheviks then added, the proletariat will win over *the entire semi-proletariat* (all the working and exploited people), will neutralise the middle peasants and *overthrow* the bourgeoisie; this will be a socialist revolution, as distinct from a bourgeois-democratic revolution. (See my pamphlet *Two Tactics*, published in 1905 and reprinted in *Twelve Years*, St. Petersburg, 1907.)

Kautsky took an indirect part in this controversy in 1905, when, in reply to an inquiry by the then Menshevik Plekhanov, he expressed an opinion that was essentially *against* Plekhanov, which provoked particular ridicule in the Bolshevik press at the time. But now Kautsky does not say *a single word* about the controversies of that time (for fear of being exposed by his own statements!), and thereby makes it utterly impossible for the German reader to understand the essence of the matter. Mr. Kautsky could not tell the German workers in 1918 that in 1905 he had been in favour of an alliance of the workers with the peasants and not with the liberal bourgeoisie, and on what conditions he had advocated this alliance, and what programme he had outlined for it.

Backing out from his old position, Kautsky, under the guise of an "economic analysis", and talking proudly about "historical materialism", now advocates the subordination of the workers to the bourgeoisie, and, with the aid of quotations from the Menshevik Maslov, chews over the old liberal views of the Mensheviks. Quotations are used to prove the new idea of the backwardness of Russia. But the deduction drawn from this new idea is the old one, that in a bourgeois revolution one must not go farther than the bourgeoisie! And this in spite of all that Marx and Engels said when comparing the bourgeois revolution of 1789-93 in France with the bourgeois revolution of 1848 in Germany!¹²⁷

Before passing to the chief "argument" and the main content of Kautsky's "economic analysis", let us note that Kautsky's very first sentences reveal a curious confusion, or superficiality, of thought.

"Agriculture, and specifically small peasant farming," our "theoretician" announces, "to this day represents the economic foundation of Russia. About four-fifths, perhaps

even five-sixths, of the population live by it" (p. 45). First of all, my dear theoretician, have you considered how many exploiters there may be among this mass of small producers? Certainly not more than one-tenth of the total, and in the towns still less, for there large-scale production is more highly developed. Take even an incredibly high figure; assume that one-fifth of the small producers are exploiters who are deprived of the franchise. Even then you will find that the 66 per cent of the votes held by the Bolsheviks at the Fifth Congress of Soviets represented the *majority of the population*. To this it must be added that there was always a considerable section of the Left Socialist-Revolutionaries who were in favour of Soviet power—in principle *all* the Left Socialist-Revolutionaries were in favour of Soviet power, and when a section of them, in July 1918, started an adventurous revolt, two new parties split away from the old party, namely, the "Narodnik Communists" and the "Revolutionary Communists"¹²⁸ (of the prominent Left Socialist-Revolutionaries who had been nominated for important posts in the government by the old party, to the first-mentioned belongs Zax, for instance, and to the second Kolegayev). So, Kautsky has himself—inadvertently—refuted the ridiculous fable that the Bolsheviks only have the backing of a minority of the population.

Secondly, my dear theoretician, have you considered the fact that the small peasant producer *inevitably* vacillates between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie? This Marxist truth, which has been confirmed by the whole modern history of Europe, Kautsky very conveniently "forgot", for it simply demolishes the Menshevik "theory" that he keeps repeating! Had Kautsky not "forgotten" this he could not have denied the need for a proletarian dictatorship in a country in which the small peasant producers predominate.

Let us examine the main content of our theoretician's "economic analysis".

That Soviet power is a dictatorship cannot be disputed, says Kautsky. "But is it a dictatorship of *the proletariat*?" (P. 34.)

"According to the Soviet Constitution, the peasants form the majority of the population entitled to participate in legislation and administration. What is presented to us as a dictatorship of *the proletariat*

would prove to be—if carried out consistently, and if, generally speaking, a class could directly exercise a dictatorship, which in reality can only be exercised by a party—a dictatorship of *the peasants*" (p. 35).

And, highly elated over so profound and clever an argument, our good Kautsky tries to be witty and says: "It would appear, therefore, that the most painless achievement of socialism is best assured when it is put in the hands of the peasants" (p. 35).

In the greatest detail, and citing a number of extremely learned quotations from the semi-liberal Maslov, our theoretician labours to prove the new idea that the peasants are interested in high grain prices, in low wages for the urban workers, etc., etc. Incidentally, the enunciation of these new ideas is the more tedious the less attention our author pays to the really new features of the post-war period—for example, that the peasants demand for their grain, not money, but goods, and that they have not enough agricultural implements, which cannot be obtained in sufficient quantities for any amount of money. But more of this later.

Thus, Kautsky charges the Bolsheviks, the party of the proletariat, with having surrendered the dictatorship, the work of achieving socialism, to the petty-bourgeois peasants. Excellent, Mr. Kautsky! But what, in your enlightened opinion, should have been the attitude of the proletarian party towards the petty-bourgeois peasants?

Our theoretician preferred to say nothing on this score—evidently bearing in mind the proverb: "Speech is silver, silence is gold." But he gives himself away by the following argument:

"At the beginning of the Soviet Republic, the peasants' Soviets were organisations of the *peasants* in general. Now this Republic proclaims that the Soviets are organisations of the proletarians and the *poor* peasants. The well-to-do peasants are deprived of the suffrage in the elections to the Soviets. The poor peasant is here recognised to be a permanent and mass product of the socialist agrarian reform under the 'dictatorship of the proletariat'" (p. 48).

What deadly irony! It is the kind that may be heard in Russia from any bourgeois: they all jeer and gloat over the fact that the Soviet Republic openly admits the existence of poor peasants. They ridicule socialism. That is their right. But a "socialist" who jeers at the fact that after

four years of a most ruinous war there remain (and will remain for a long time) poor peasants in Russia—such a “socialist” could only have been born at a time of wholesale apostasy.

And further:

“...The Soviet Republic interferes in the relations between the rich and poor peasants, but not by redistributing the land. In order to relieve the bread shortage in the towns, detachments of armed workers are sent into the countryside to take away the rich peasants' surplus stocks of grain. Part of that stock is given to the urban population, the other—to the poorer peasants” (p. 48).

Of course, Kautsky the socialist and Marxist is profoundly indignant at the idea that such a measure should be extended beyond the environs of the large towns (and we have extended it to the whole of the country). With the matchless, incomparable and admirable coolness (or pigheadedness) of a philistine, Kautsky the socialist and Marxist sermonises: ... “It [the expropriation of the well-to-do peasants] introduces a new element of unrest and civil war into the process of production” ... (civil war introduced into the “process of production”—that is something supernatural!)... “which stands in urgent need of peace and security for its recovery” (p. 49).

Oh, yes, of course, Kautsky the Marxist and socialist must sigh and shed tears over the subject of peace and security for the exploiters and grain profiteers who hoard their surplus stocks, sabotage the grain monopoly law, and reduce the urban population to famine. “We are all socialists and Marxists and internationalists,” the Kautskys, Heinrich Webers¹²⁸ (Vienna), Longuets (Paris), MacDonalds (London), etc., sing in chorus. “We are all in favour of a working-class revolution. Only ... only we would like a revolution that does not infringe upon the peace and security of the grain profiteers! And we camouflage this sordid subservience to the capitalists by a ‘Marxist’ reference to the ‘process of production’....” If this is Marxism, what is servility to the bourgeoisie?

Just see what our theoretician arrives at. He accuses the Bolsheviks of presenting the dictatorship of the peasants as the dictatorship of the proletariat. But at the same time he accuses us of introducing civil war into the rural districts

(which we think is to our *credit*), of dispatching into the countryside armed detachments of workers, who publicly proclaim that they are exercising the "dictatorship of the proletariat and the poor peasants", assist the latter and confiscate from the profiteers and the rich peasants the surplus stocks of grain which they are hoarding in contravention of the grain monopoly law.

On the one hand, our Marxist theoretician stands for pure democracy, for the subordination of the revolutionary class, the leader of the working and exploited people, to the majority of the population (including, therefore, the exploiters). On the other hand, as an argument *against* us, he explains that the revolution must inevitably bear a bourgeois character —bourgeois, because the life of the peasants as a whole is based on bourgeois social relations—and at the same time he pretends to uphold the proletarian, class, Marxist point of view!

Instead of an "economic analysis" we have a first-class hodge-podge. Instead of Marxism we have fragments of liberal doctrines and the preaching of servility to the bourgeoisie and the kulaks.

The question which Kautsky has so tangled up was fully explained by the Bolsheviks as far back as 1905. Yes, our revolution is a bourgeois revolution *as long* as we march *with* the peasants *as a whole*. This has been as clear as clear can be to us; we have said it hundreds and thousands of times since 1905, and we have never attempted to skip this necessary stage of the historical process or abolish it by decrees. Kautsky's efforts to "expose" us on this point merely expose his own confusion of mind and his fear to recall what he wrote in 1905, when he was not yet a renegade.

Beginning with *April* 1917, however, long before the October Revolution, that is, long before we assumed power, we publicly declared and explained to the people: the revolution cannot now stop at this stage, for the country has marched forward, capitalism has advanced, ruin has reached fantastic dimensions, which (whether one likes it or not) *will demand* steps forward, *to socialism*. For there is *no* other way of advancing, of saving the war-weary country and of alleviating the sufferings of the working and exploited people.

Things have turned out just as we said they would. The course taken by the revolution has confirmed the correctness of our reasoning. *First*, with the "whole" of the peasants against the monarchy, against the landowners, against medievalism (and to that extent the revolution remains bourgeois, bourgeois-democratic). *Then*, with the poor peasants, with the semi-proletarians, with all the exploited, *against capitalism*, including the rural rich, the kulaks, the profiteers, and to that extent the revolution becomes a *socialist* one. To attempt to raise an artificial Chinese Wall between the first and second, to separate them *by anything else* than the degree of preparedness of the proletariat and the degree of its unity with the poor peasants, means to distort Marxism dreadfully, to vulgarise it, to substitute liberalism in its place. It means smuggling in a reactionary defence of the bourgeoisie against the socialist proletariat by means of quasi-scientific references to the progressive character of the bourgeoisie in comparison with medievalism.

Incidentally, the Soviets represent an immensely higher form and type of democracy just because, by uniting and drawing the *mass of workers and peasants* into political life, they serve as a most sensitive barometer, the one closest to the "people" (in the sense in which Marx, in 1871, spoke of a real people's revolution¹³⁰), of the growth and development of the political, class maturity of the people. The Soviet Constitution was not drawn up according to some "plan"; it was not drawn up in a study, and was not foisted on the working people by bourgeois lawyers. No, this Constitution *grew up* in the course of the development of the *class struggle* in proportion as *class antagonisms* matured. The very facts which Kautsky himself has to admit prove this.

At first, the Soviets embraced the peasants as a whole. It was owing to the immaturity, the backwardness, the ignorance of the poor peasants that the leadership passed into the hands of the kulaks, the rich, the capitalists and the petty-bourgeois intellectuals. That was the period of the domination of the petty bourgeoisie, of the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries (only fools or renegades like Kautsky can regard either of these as socialists). The petty bourgeoisie inevitably and unavoidably vacillated between the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie (Kerensky, Kornilov,

Savinkov) and the dictatorship of the proletariat; for owing to the basic features of its economic position, the petty bourgeoisie is incapable of doing anything independently. Kautsky, by the way, completely renounces Marxism by confining himself in his analysis of the Russian revolution to the legal and formal concept of "democracy", which serves the bourgeoisie as a screen to conceal their domination and as a means of deceiving the people, and by *forgetting* that in practice "democracy" sometimes stands for the *dictatorship of the bourgeoisie*, sometimes for the impotent reformism of the petty bourgeoisie who submit to that dictatorship, and so on. According to Kautsky, in a capitalist country there were bourgeois parties and there was a proletarian party (the Bolsheviks), which led the majority, the mass of the proletariat, but *there were no petty-bourgeois parties!* The Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries had no *class roots*, no petty-bourgeois roots!

The vacillations of the petty bourgeoisie, of the Mensheviks and the Socialist-Revolutionaries, helped to enlighten the people and to repel the overwhelming majority of them, all the "lower sections", all the proletarians and semi-proletarians, from such "leaders". The Bolsheviks won predominance in the Soviets (in Petrograd and Moscow by October 1917); the split among the Socialist-Revolutionaries and the Mensheviks became more pronounced.

The victorious Bolshevik revolution meant the end of vacillation, meant the complete destruction of the monarchy and of the landlord system (which had *not* been destroyed before the October Revolution). We carried the *bourgeois* revolution to its conclusion. The peasants supported us *as a whole*. Their antagonism to the socialist proletariat could not reveal itself all at once. The Soviets united the peasants *in general*. The class divisions among the peasants had not yet matured, had not yet come into the open.

That process took place in the summer and autumn of 1918. The Czech counter-revolutionary mutiny roused the kulaks. A wave of kulak revolts swept over Russia. The poor peasants learned, not from books or newspapers, but from *life itself*, that their interests were irreconcilably antagonistic to those of the kulaks, the rich, the rural bourgeoisie. Like every other petty-bourgeois party, the

"Left Socialist-Revolutionaries" reflected the vacillation of the people, and in the summer of 1918 they split: one section joined forces with the Czechs (the rebellion in Moscow, when Prosyán, having seized the Telegraph Office—for one hour!—announced to Russia that the Bolsheviks had been overthrown; then the treachery of Muravyov,¹³¹ Commander-in-Chief of the army that was fighting the Czechs, etc.), while the other section, that mentioned above, remained with the Bolsheviks.

The growing food shortage in the towns lent increasing urgency to the question of the grain monopoly (this Kautsky the theoretician completely "forgot" in his economic analysis, which is a mere repetition of platitudes gleaned ten years ago from Maslov's writings!).

The old landowner and bourgeois, and even democratic-republican, state had sent to the rural districts armed detachments which were practically at the beck and call of the bourgeoisie. Mr. Kautsky does not know this! He does not regard that as the "dictatorship of the bourgeoisie"—Heaven forbid! That is "pure democracy", especially if endorsed by a bourgeois parliament! Nor has Kautsky "heard" that, in the summer and autumn of 1917, Avksent'yev and S. Maslov, in company with the Kerenskys, the Tsere-telis and other Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks, arrested members of the Land Committees; he does not say a word about that!

The whole point is that a bourgeois state which is exercising the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie through a democratic republic cannot confess to the people that it is serving the bourgeoisie; it cannot tell the truth, and has to play the hypocrite.

But the state of the Paris Commune type, the Soviet state, openly and frankly tells the people the *truth* and declares that it is the dictatorship of the proletariat and the poor peasants; and by this truth it wins over scores and scores of millions of new citizens who are kept down in any democratic republic, but who are drawn by the Soviets into political life, *into democracy*, into the administration of the state. The Soviet Republic sends into the rural districts detachments of armed workers, primarily the more advanced, from the capitals. These workers carry socialism into the

countryside, win over the poor, organise and enlighten them, and help them to *suppress the resistance of the bourgeoisie*.

All who are familiar with the situation and have been in the rural districts declare that it is only now, in the summer and autumn of 1918, that the rural districts *themselves* are passing through the "October" (i.e., proletarian) Revolution. Things are beginning to change. The wave of kulak revolts is giving way to a rise of the poor, to a growth of the "Poor Peasants' Committees". In the army, the number of workers who become commissars, officers and commanders of divisions and armies is increasing. And at the very time that the simple-minded Kautsky, frightened by the July (1918) crisis¹³² and the lamentations of the bourgeoisie, was running after the latter like a cockerel, and writing a whole pamphlet breathing the conviction that the Bolsheviks are on the eve of being overthrown by the peasants; at the very time that this simpleton regarded the secession of the Left Socialist-Revolutionaries as a "narrowing" (p. 37) of the circle of those who support the Bolsheviks—at that very time the *real* circle of supporters of Bolshevism was *expanding enormously*, because scores and scores of millions of the village poor were freeing themselves from the tutelage and influence of the kulaks and village bourgeoisie and were awakening to *independent* political life.

We have lost hundreds of Left Socialist-Revolutionaries, spineless intellectuals and kulaks from among the peasants; but we have gained millions of poor people. *

A year after the proletarian revolution in the capitals, and under its influence and with its assistance, the proletarian revolution began in the remote rural districts, and it has finally consolidated the power of the Soviets and Bolshevism, and has finally proved there is no force in the country that can withstand it.

Having completed the bourgeois-democratic revolution in alliance with the peasants as a whole, the Russian proletariat finally passed on to the socialist revolution when it succeeded in splitting the rural population, in winning over

* At the Sixth Congress of Soviets (November 6-9, 1918), there were 967 voting delegates, 950 of whom were Bolsheviks, and 351 delegates with voice but no vote, of whom 335 were Bolsheviks, i.e., 97 per cent of the total number of delegates were Bolsheviks.

the rural proletarians and semi-proletarians, and in uniting them against the kulaks and the bourgeoisie, including the peasant bourgeoisie.

Now, if the Bolshevik proletariat in the capitals and large industrial centres had not been able to rally the village poor around itself against the rich peasants, this would indeed have proved that Russia was "unripe" for socialist revolution. The peasants would then have remained an "integral whole", i.e., they would have remained under the economic, political, and moral leadership of the kulaks, the rich, the bourgeoisie, and the revolution would not have passed beyond the limits of a bourgeois-democratic revolution. (But, let it be said in parenthesis, even if this had been the case, it would not have proved that the proletariat should not have taken power, for it is the proletariat alone that has really carried the bourgeois-democratic revolution to its conclusion, it is the proletariat alone that has done something really important to bring nearer the world proletarian revolution, and the proletariat alone that has created the Soviet state, which, after the Paris Commune, is the second step towards the socialist state.)

On the other hand, if the Bolshevik proletariat had tried at once, in October-November 1917, without waiting for the class differentiation in the rural districts, without being able to *prepare* it and bring it about, to "decree" a civil war or the "introduction of socialism" in the rural districts, had tried to do without a temporary bloc with the peasants in general, without making a number of concessions to the middle peasants, etc., that would have been a *Blanquist*¹³³ distortion of Marxism, an attempt by the *minority* to impose its will upon the majority; it would have been a theoretical absurdity, revealing a failure to understand that a general peasant revolution is *still* a bourgeois revolution, and that *without a series of transitions, of transitional stages*, it cannot be transformed into a socialist revolution in a backward country.

Kautsky has confused *everything* in this very important theoretical and political problem, and has, in practice, proved to be nothing but a servant of the bourgeoisie, howling against the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Kautsky has introduced a similar, if not greater, confusion into another extremely interesting and important question, namely: was the *legislative* activity of the Soviet Republic in the sphere of agrarian reform—that most difficult and yet most important of socialist reforms—based on sound principles and then properly carried out? We should be boundlessly grateful to any West-European Marxist who, after studying at least the most important documents, gave a *criticism* of our policy, because he would thereby help us immensely, and would also help the revolution that is maturing throughout the world. But instead of criticism Kautsky produces an incredible theoretical muddle, which converts Marxism into liberalism and which, in practice, is a series of idle, venomous, vulgar sallies against the Bolsheviks. Let the reader judge for himself:

"Large landed estates could not be preserved. This was a result of the revolution. That was at once clear. The transfer of the large estates to the peasant population became inevitable...." (That is not true, Mr. Kautsky. You substitute what is "clear" to you for the attitude of the different classes towards the question. The history of the revolution has shown that the coalition government of the bourgeois and the petty bourgeois, the Mensheviks and the Socialist-Revolutionaries, pursued a policy of preserving big land-ownership. This was proved particularly by S. Maslov's bill and by the arrest of the members of the Land Committees.¹³⁴ Without the dictatorship of the proletariat, the "peasant population" would not have vanquished the landowners, who had joined forces with the capitalists.)

"...But as to the forms in which it was to take place, there was no unity. Various solutions were conceivable...." (Kautsky is most of all concerned about the "unity" of the "socialists", no matter who called themselves by that name. He forgets that the principal classes in capitalist society are bound to arrive at different solutions.) "...From the socialist point of view, the most rational solution would have been to convert the large estates into state property and to allow the peasants who hitherto had been employed on them as wage-labourers to cultivate them in the form of co-operative societies. But such a solution presupposes the existence of a type of farm labourer that did not exist in

Russia. Another solution would have been to convert the large estates into state property and to divide them up into small plots to be rented out to peasants who owned little land. Had that been done, at least something socialistic would have been achieved...."

As usual Kautsky confines himself to the celebrated: on the one hand it cannot but be admitted, and on the other hand it must be confessed. He places different solutions *side by side* without a thought—the only realistic and Marxist thought—as to what must be the *transitional stages* from capitalism to communism in such-and-such *specific* conditions. There are farm labourers in Russia, but not many; and Kautsky did not touch on the question—which the Soviet government *did raise*—of the method of transition to a communal and co-operative form of land cultivation. The most curious thing, however, is that Kautsky claims to see "something socialistic" in the renting out of small plots of land. In reality, this is a *petty-bourgeois* slogan, and there is *nothing* "socialistic" in it. If the "state" that rents out the land is *not* a state of the Paris Commune type, but a parliamentary bourgeois republic (and that is exactly Kautsky's constant assumption), the renting of land in small plots is a typical *liberal reform*.

Kautsky says nothing about the Soviet government having abolished *all* private ownership of land. Worse than that: he resorts to an incredible forgery and quotes the decrees of the Soviet government in such a way as to omit the most essential.

After stating that "small production strives for complete private ownership of the means of production", and that the Constituent Assembly would have been the "only authority" capable of preventing the dividing up of the land (an assertion which will evoke laughter in Russia, where everybody knows that the Soviets *alone* are recognised as authoritative by the workers and peasants, while the Constituent Assembly has become the slogan of the Czechs and the landowners), Kautsky continues:

"One of the first decrees of the Soviet Government declared that: (1) Landed proprietorship is abolished forthwith without any compensation. (2) The landed estates, as also all crown, monastery and church lands, with all their livestock, implements, buildings and everything

pertaining thereto, shall be placed at the disposal of the volost Land Committees of the uyezd Soviets of Peasants' Deputies pending the settlement of the land question by the Constituent Assembly."

Having quoted *only these two clauses*, Kautsky concludes:

"The reference to the Constituent Assembly has remained a dead letter. In point of fact, the peasants in the separate volosts could do as they pleased with the land" (p. 47).

Here you have an example of Kautsky's "criticism"! Here you have a "scientific" work which is more like a fraud. The German reader is induced to believe that the Bolsheviks capitulated before the peasants on the question of private ownership of land, that the Bolsheviks permitted the peasants to act locally ("in the separate volosts") in whatever way they pleased!

But in reality, the decree Kautsky quotes—the first to be promulgated, on October 26, 1917 (old style)—consists not of two, but of five clauses, *plus* eight clauses of the Mandate, which, it was expressly stated, "shall serve as a guide".

Clause 3 of the decree states that the estates are transferred "*to the people*", and the "exact inventories of all property confiscated" shall be drawn up and the property "protected in the strictest revolutionary way". And the Mandate declares that "private ownership of land shall be abolished for ever", that "lands on which high-level scientific farming is practised ... *shall not be divided up*", that "all livestock and farm implements of the confiscated estates shall pass into the exclusive use of the state or a commune, depending on size and importance, and no compensation shall be paid for this", and that "all land shall become part of the national land fund".

Further, simultaneously with the dissolution of the Constituent Assembly (January 5, 1918), the Third Congress of Soviets adopted the *Declaration of Rights of the Working and Exploited People*, which now forms part of the Fundamental Law of the Soviet Republic. Article 2, paragraph 1 of this Declaration states that "private ownership of land is hereby abolished", and that "model estates and agricultural enterprises are proclaimed national property".

So, the reference to the Constituent Assembly did *not* remain a dead letter, because another national representative body, immeasurably more authoritative in the eyes of the

peasants, took upon itself the solution of the agrarian problem.

Again, on February 6(19), 1918, the land socialisation law was promulgated, which once more confirmed the abolition of all private ownership of land, and placed the land and *all private stock and implements* at the disposal of the Soviet authorities *under the control of the federal Soviet government*. Among the duties connected with the disposal of the land, the law prescribed:

"the development of collective farming as more advantageous from the point of view of economy of labour and produce, at the expense of individual farming, with a view to transition to socialist farming" (Article 11, paragraph e).

The same law, in establishing the principle of *equal* land tenure, replied to the fundamental question: "Who has a right to the use of the land?" in the following manner:

(Article 20.) "Plots of land surface within the borders of the Russian Soviet Federative Republic may be used for public and private needs. A. For cultural and educational purposes: (1) by the state as represented by the organs of Soviet power (federal, as well as in regions, gubernias, uyezds, volosts, and villages), and (2) by public bodies (under the control, and with the permission, of the local Soviet authorities); B. For agricultural purposes: (3) by agricultural communes, (4) by agricultural co-operative societies, (5) by village communities, (6) by individual families and persons...."

The reader will see that Kautsky has completely distorted the facts, and has given the German reader an absolutely false view of the agrarian policy and agrarian legislation of the proletarian state in Russia.

Kautsky proved even unable to formulate the theoretically important fundamental questions!

These questions are:

(1) Equal land tenure and

(2) Nationalisation of the land—the relation of these two measures to socialism in general, and to the transition from capitalism to communism in particular.

(3) Farming in common as a transition from small scattered farming to large-scale collective farming; does the manner in which this question is dealt with in Soviet legislation meet the requirements of socialism?

On the first question it is necessary, first of all, to establish the following two fundamental facts: (a) in reviewing the

experience of 1905 (I may refer, for instance, to my work on the agrarian problem in the First Russian Revolution), the Bolsheviks pointed to the democratically progressive, the democratically revolutionary meaning of the slogan "equal land tenure", and in 1917, *before* the October Revolution, they spoke of this quite definitely; (b) when enforcing the land socialisation law—the "spirit" of which is equal land tenure—the Bolsheviks most explicitly and definitely declared: this is not our idea, we do not agree with this slogan, but we think it our duty to enforce it because this is the demand of the overwhelming majority of the peasants. And the idea and demands of the majority of the working people are things that the working people must *discard of their own accord*: such demands cannot be either "abolished" or "skipped over". We Bolsheviks shall *help* the peasants to discard petty-bourgeois slogans, to *pass* from them as quickly and as easily as possible to socialist slogans.

A Marxist theoretician who wanted to help the working-class revolution by his scientific analysis should have answered the following questions: first, is it true that the idea of equal land tenure has a democratically revolutionary meaning of carrying the *bourgeois*-democratic revolution to its conclusion? Secondly, did the Bolsheviks act rightly in helping to pass by their votes (and in most loyally observing) the petty-bourgeois equal land tenure law?

Kautsky failed even to *perceive* what, theoretically, was the crux of the problem!

Kautsky will never be able to refute the view that the idea of equal land tenure has a progressive and revolutionary value in the bourgeois-democratic revolution. Such a revolution cannot go beyond this. By reaching its limit, it *all the more clearly, rapidly and easily* reveals to the people the *inadequacy* of bourgeois-democratic solutions and the necessity of proceeding beyond their limits, of passing on to *socialism*.

The peasants, who have overthrown tsarism and the land-owners, dream of equal land tenure, and no power on earth could have stopped the peasants, once they had been freed both from the landowners and from the *bourgeois* parliamentary republican state. The workers say to the peasants:

We shall help you reach "ideal" capitalism, for equal land tenure is the idealisation of capitalism by the small producer. At the same time we shall prove to you its inadequacy and the necessity of passing to farming in common.

It would be interesting to see Kautsky's attempt to disprove that *this kind* of leadership of the peasant struggle by the proletariat was right.

Kautsky, however, preferred to evade the question altogether....

Next, Kautsky deliberately deceived his German readers by withholding from them the fact that in its *land law* the Soviet government gave *direct* preference to communes and co-operative societies.

With all the peasants right through to the end of the bourgeois-democratic revolution; and with the poor, the proletarian and semi-proletarian section of the peasants, forward to the socialist revolution! That has been the policy of the Bolsheviks, and it is the only Marxist policy.

But Kautsky is all muddled and incapable of formulating a single question! On the one hand, he *dare not* say that the workers should have parted company with the peasants over the question of equal land tenure, for he realises that it would have been absurd (and, moreover, in 1905, when he was not yet a renegade, he himself clearly and explicitly advocated an alliance between the workers and peasants as a condition for the victory of the revolution). On the other hand, he sympathetically quotes the liberal platitudes of the Menshevik Maslov, who "proves" that petty-bourgeois equal land tenure is utopian and reactionary *from the point of view of socialism*, but hushes up the progressive and revolutionary character of the petty-bourgeois struggle for equality and equal tenure *from the point of view of the bourgeois-democratic revolution*.

Kautsky is in a hopeless muddle: note that he (in 1918) *insists* on the *bourgeois* character of the Russian revolution. He (in 1918) peremptorily says: Don't go beyond these limits! Yet this very same Kautsky sees "something *socialistic*" (for a *bourgeois* revolution) in the *petty-bourgeois* reform of renting out small plots of land to the *poor* peasants (which is an approximation to equal land tenure)!

Understand this if you can!

In addition to all this, Kautsky displays a philistine inability to take into account the real policy of a definite party. He quotes the empty *phrases* of the Menshevik Maslov and *refuses to see the real* policy the Menshevik Party pursued in 1917, when, in "coalition" with the landowners and Cadets, they advocated what was virtually a *liberal agrarian reform and compromise with the landowners* (proof: the arrest of the members of the Land Committees and S. Maslov's land bill).

Kautsky failed to notice that P. Maslov's phrases about the reactionary and utopian character of petty-bourgeois equality are really a screen to conceal the Menshevik policy of *compromise* between the peasants and the landowners (i.e., of supporting the landowners in duping the peasants), instead of the *revolutionary* overthrow of the landowners by the peasants.

What a "Marxist" Kautsky is!

It was the Bolsheviks who strictly differentiated between the bourgeois-democratic revolution and the socialist revolution: by carrying the former through, they opened the door for the transition to the latter. This was the only policy that was revolutionary and Marxist.

It would have been wiser for Kautsky not to repeat the feeble liberal witticism: "Never yet have the small peasants anywhere adopted collective farming under the influence of theoretical convictions" (p. 50).

How very smart!

But never as yet and nowhere have the small peasants of any large country been under the influence of a proletarian state.

Never as yet and nowhere have the small peasants engaged in an open class struggle reaching the extent of a civil war between the poor peasants and the rich peasants, *with* propagandist, political, economic and military support given to the poor by a proletarian state.

Never as yet and nowhere have the profiteers and the rich amassed such wealth out of war, while the mass of peasants have been so utterly ruined.

Kautsky just reiterates the old stuff, he just chews the old cud, afraid even to give thought to the new tasks of the proletarian dictatorship.

But what, dear Kautsky, if the peasants *lack* implements for small-scale farming and the proletarian state *helps* them to obtain machines for collective farming—is that a “theoretical conviction”?

We shall now pass to the question of nationalisation of the land. Our Narodniks, including all the Left Socialist-Revolutionaries, deny that the measure we have adopted is nationalisation of the land. They are wrong in theory. Insofar as we remain within the framework of commodity production and capitalism, the abolition of private ownership of land is nationalisation of the land. The term “socialisation” merely expresses a tendency, a desire, the preparation for the transition to socialism.

What should be the attitude of Marxists towards nationalisation of the land?

Here, too, Kautsky fails even to formulate the theoretical question, or, which is still worse, he deliberately evades it, although one knows from Russian literature that Kautsky is aware of the old controversies among the Russian Marxists on the question of nationalisation, municipalisation (i.e., the transfer of the large estates to the local self-government authorities), or division of the land.

Kautsky's assertion that to transfer the large estates to the state and rent them out in small plots to peasants who own little land would be achieving “something socialistic” is a downright mockery of Marxism. We have already shown that there is nothing socialistic about it. But that is not all; it would not even be carrying the *bourgeois-democratic* revolution to its conclusion. Kautsky's great misfortune is that he placed his trust in the Mensheviks. Hence the curious position that while insisting on our revolution having a bourgeois character and reproaching the Bolsheviks for taking it into their heads to proceed to socialism, he *himself* proposes a liberal reform under the guise of socialism, *without carrying this reform* to the point of completely clearing away all the survivals of medievalism in agrarian relations! The arguments of Kautsky, as of his Menshevik advisers, amount to a defence of the liberal bourgeoisie, who fear revolution, instead of defence of consistent bourgeois-democratic revolution.

Indeed, why should only the large estates, and not all the land, be converted into state property? The liberal bourgeoisie thereby achieve the maximum preservation of the old conditions (i.e., the least consistency in revolution) and the maximum facility for a reversion to the old conditions. The radical bourgeoisie, i.e., the bourgeoisie that want to carry the bourgeois revolution to its conclusion, put forward the slogan of *nationalisation of the land*.

Kautsky, who in the dim and distant past, some twenty years ago, wrote an excellent Marxist work on the agrarian question, cannot but know that Marx declared that land nationalisation is in fact a *consistent* slogan of the *bourgeoisie*.¹³⁵ Kautsky cannot but be aware of Marx's controversy with Rodbertus, and Marx's remarkable passages in his *Theories of Surplus Value* where the revolutionary significance—in the bourgeois-democratic sense—of land nationalisation is explained with particular clarity.

The Menshevik P. Maslov, whom Kautsky, unfortunately for himself, chose as an adviser, denied that the Russian peasants would agree to the nationalisation of all the land (including the peasants' lands). To a certain extent, this view of Maslov's could be connected with his "original" theory (which merely parrots the bourgeois critics of Marx), namely, his repudiation of absolute rent and his recognition of the "law" (or "fact", as Maslov expressed it) "of diminishing returns".

In point of fact, however, already the 1905 Revolution revealed that the vast majority of the peasants in Russia, members of village communes as well as homestead peasants, were in favour of nationalisation of all the land. The 1917 Revolution confirmed this, and after the assumption of power by the proletariat this was done. The Bolsheviks remained loyal to Marxism and never tried (in spite of Kautsky, who, without a scrap of evidence, accuses us of doing so) to "skip" the bourgeois-democratic revolution. The Bolsheviks, first of all, helped the most radical, most revolutionary of the bourgeois-democratic ideologists of the peasants, those who stood closest to the proletariat, namely, the Left Socialist-Revolutionaries, to carry out what was in effect nationalisation of the land. On October 26, 1917, i.e., on the very first day of the proletarian,

socialist revolution, private ownership of land was abolished in Russia.

This laid the foundation, the most perfect from the point of view of the development of capitalism (Kautsky cannot deny this without breaking with Marx), and at the same time created an agrarian system which is the *most flexible* from the point of view of the transition to socialism. From the bourgeois-democratic point of view, the revolutionary peasants in Russia *could go no farther: there can be nothing "more ideal"* from this point of view, nothing "more radical" (from this same point of view) than nationalisation of the land and equal land tenure. It was the Bolsheviks, and only the Bolsheviks, who, thanks only to the victory of the *proletarian* revolution, helped the peasants to carry the bourgeois-democratic revolution really to its conclusion. And only in this way did they do the utmost to facilitate and accelerate the transition to the socialist revolution.

One can judge from this what an incredible muddle Kautsky offers to his readers when he accuses the Bolsheviks of failing to understand the bourgeois character of the revolution, and yet himself betrays such a departure from Marxism that he *says nothing* about nationalisation of the land and presents the least revolutionary (from the bourgeois point of view) liberal agrarian reform as "something socialistic"!

We have now come to the third question formulated above, namely, to what extent the proletarian dictatorship in Russia has taken into account the necessity of passing to farming in common. Here again, Kautsky commits something very much in the nature of a forgery: he quotes only the "theses" of one Bolshevik which speak of the task of passing to farming in common! After quoting one of these theses, our "theoretician" triumphantly exclaims:

"Unfortunately, a task is not accomplished by the fact that it is called a task. For the time being, collective farming in Russia is doomed to remain on paper only. Never yet have the small peasants anywhere adopted collective farming under the influence of theoretical convictions" (p. 50).

Never as yet and nowhere has a literary swindle been perpetrated equal to that to which Kautsky has stooped. He quotes "theses", but says nothing about the *law* of the Soviet

government. He talks about "theoretical convictions", but says nothing about the proletarian state power which holds in its hands the factories and goods! All that Kautsky the Marxist wrote in 1899 in his *Agrarian Question* about the means at the disposal of the proletarian state for bringing about the gradual transition of the small peasants to socialism has been forgotten by Kautsky the renegade in 1918.

Of course, a few hundred state-supported agricultural communes and state farms (i.e., large farms cultivated by associations of workers at the expense of the state) are very little, but can Kautsky's ignoring of this fact be called "criticism"?

The nationalisation of the land that has been effected in Russia by the proletarian dictatorship has best ensured the carrying of the bourgeois-democratic revolution to its conclusion—even in the event of a victory of the counter-revolution causing a reversion from land nationalisation to land division (I made a special examination of this possibility in my pamphlet on the agrarian programme of the Marxists in the 1905 Revolution). In addition, the nationalisation of the land has given the proletarian state the maximum opportunity of passing to socialism in agriculture.

To sum up, Kautsky has presented us, as far as theory is concerned, with an incredible hodge-podge which is a complete renunciation of Marxism, and, as far as practice is concerned, with a policy of servility to the bourgeoisie and their reformism. A fine criticism indeed!

* * *

Kautsky begins his "economic analysis" of industry with the following magnificent argument:

Russia has a large-scale capitalist industry. Cannot a socialist system of production be built up on this foundation? "One might think so if socialism meant that the workers of the separate factories and mines made these their property" (literally appropriated these for themselves) "in order to carry on production separately at each factory" (p. 52). "This very day, August 5, as I am writing these lines," Kautsky adds, "a speech is reported from Moscow delivered by Lenin on August 2, in which he is stated to have declared:

'The workers are holding the factories firmly in their hands, and the peasants will not return the land to the landowners.' Up till now, the slogan: the factories to the workers, and the land to the peasants, has been an anarcho-syndicalist slogan, not a Social-Democratic one" (pp. 52-53).

I have quoted this passage in full so that the Russian workers, who formerly respected Kautsky, and quite rightly, might see for themselves the methods employed by this deserter to the bourgeois camp.

Just think: on August 5, when numerous decrees on the nationalisation of factories in Russia had been issued—and not a single factory had been "appropriated" by the workers, but had *all* been converted into the property of the Republic—on August 5, Kautsky, on the strength of an obviously crooked interpretation of one sentence in my speech, tries to make the German readers believe that in Russia the factories are being turned over to individual groups of workers! And after that Kautsky, at great length, chews the cud about it being wrong to turn over factories to individual groups of workers!

This is not criticism, it is the trick of a lackey of the bourgeoisie, whom the capitalists have hired to slander the workers' revolution.

The factories must be turned over to the state, or to the municipalities, or the consumers' co-operative societies, says Kautsky over and over again, and finally adds:

"This is what they are now trying to do in Russia...." Now! What does that mean? In August? Why, could not Kautsky have commissioned his friends Stein or Axelrod, or any of the other friends of the Russian bourgeoisie, to translate at least one of the decrees on the factories?

"How far they have gone in this direction, we cannot yet tell. At all events, this aspect of the activity of the Soviet Republic is of the greatest interest to us, but it still remains entirely shrouded in darkness. There is no lack of decrees...." (That is why Kautsky ignores their *content*, or conceals it from his readers!) "But there is no reliable information as to the effect of these decrees. Socialist production is impossible without all-round, detailed, reliable and rapidly informative statistics. The Soviet Republic cannot possibly have created such statistics yet. What we learn about its economic activities is highly contradictory and can in no way be verified. This, too, is a result of the dictatorship and the suppression of democracy. There is no freedom of the press, or of speech" (p. 53).

This is how history is written! From a "free" press of the capitalists and Dutov men Kautsky would have received information about factories being taken over by the workers.... This "serious savant" who stands above classes is magnificent, indeed! About the countless facts which show that the factories are being turned over to the Republic *only*, that they are managed by an organ of Soviet power, the Supreme Economic Council, which is constituted mainly of workers elected by the trade unions, Kautsky refuses to say a single word. With the obstinacy of the "man in the muffler", he stubbornly keeps repeating one thing: give me peaceful democracy, without civil war, without a dictatorship and with good statistics (the Soviet Republic has created a statistical service in which the best statistical experts in Russia are employed, but, of course, ideal statistics cannot be obtained so quickly). In a word, what Kautsky demands is a revolution without revolution, without fierce struggle, without violence. It is equivalent to asking for strikes in which workers and employers do not get excited. Try to find the difference between this kind of "socialist" and common liberal bureaucrat!

So, relying upon such "factual material", i.e., deliberately and contemptuously ignoring the innumerable facts, Kautsky "concludes":

"It is doubtful whether the Russian proletariat has obtained more in the sense of real practical gains, and not of mere decrees, under the Soviet Republic than it would have obtained from a Constituent Assembly, in which, as in the Soviets, socialists, although of a different hue, predominated" (p. 58).

A gem, is it not? We would advise Kautsky's admirers to circulate this utterance as widely as possible among the Russian workers, for Kautsky could not have provided better material for gauging the depth of his political degradation. Comrade workers, Kerensky, too, was a "socialist", only of a "different hue"! Kautsky the historian is satisfied with the name, the title which the Right Socialist-Revolutionaries and the Mensheviks "appropriated" to themselves. Kautsky the historian refuses even to listen to the facts which show that under Kerensky the Mensheviks and the Right Socialist-Revolutionaries supported the imperialist policy and marauding practices of the bourgeoisie; he is

discreetly silent about the fact that the majority in the Constituent Assembly consisted of these very champions of imperialist war and bourgeois dictatorship. And this is called "economic analysis"!

In conclusion let me quote another sample of this "economic analysis":

"...After nine months' existence, the Soviet Republic, instead of spreading general well-being, felt itself obliged to explain why there is general want" (p. 41).

We are accustomed to hear such arguments from the lips of the Cadets. All the flunkeys of the bourgeoisie in Russia argue in this way: show us, after nine months, your general well-being—and this after four years of devastating war, with foreign capital giving all-round support to the sabotage and rebellions of the bourgeoisie in Russia. *Actually*, there has remained absolutely no difference whatever, not a shadow of difference, between Kautsky and a counter-revolutionary bourgeois. His honeyed talk, cloaked in the guise of "socialism", only repeats what the Kornilov men, the Dutov men and Krasnov men in Russia say bluntly, straightforwardly and without embellishment.

* * *

The above lines were written on November 9, 1918. That same night news was received from Germany announcing the beginning of a victorious revolution, first in Kiel and other northern towns and ports, where power has passed into the hands of Councils of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, then in Berlin, where, too, power has passed into the hands of a Council.

The conclusion which still remained to be written to my pamphlet on Kautsky and on the proletarian revolution is now superfluous.

November 10, 1918

*Appendix I*THESES ON THE CONSTITUENT ASSEMBLY¹³⁶*Appendix II*

VANDERVELDE'S NEW BOOK ON THE STATE

It was only after I had read Kautsky's book that I had the opportunity to acquaint myself with Vandervelde's *Socialism versus the State* (Paris, 1918). A comparison of the two books involuntarily suggests itself. Kautsky is the ideological leader of the Second International (1889-1914), while Vandervelde, in his capacity of Chairman of the International Socialist Bureau,¹³⁷ is its official representative. Both represent the complete bankruptcy of the Second International, and both with the dexterity of experienced journalists "skilfully" mask this bankruptcy and their own bankruptcy and desertion to the bourgeoisie with Marxist catchwords. One gives us a striking example of what is typical of German opportunism, ponderous, theorising and grossly falsifying Marxism by trimming it of all that is unacceptable to the bourgeoisie. The other is typical of the Latin—to a certain extent, one may say, of the West-European (that is, west of Germany)—variety of prevailing opportunism, which is more flexible, less ponderous, and which falsifies Marxism by the same fundamental method, but in a more subtle manner.

Both radically distort Marx's teaching on the state as well as his teaching on the dictatorship of the proletariat; Vandervelde deals more with the former subject, Kautsky with the latter. Both obscure the very close and inseparable connection that exists between the two subjects. Both are revolutionaries and Marxists in word, but renegades in practice, who strain every effort to *dissociate themselves* from revolution. Neither of them has anything that permeates the works of Marx and Engels, and that actually distinguishes

socialism from a bourgeois caricature of it, namely, the elucidation of the tasks of revolution as *distinct* from the tasks of reform, the elucidation of revolutionary tactics as distinct from reformist tactics, the elucidation of the role of the proletariat in the *abolition* of the system, order or regime of wage-slavery as distinct from the role of the proletariat of the "Great" Powers which shares with the bourgeoisie a particle of the latter's imperialist superprofits and superbooty.

We shall quote a few of Vandervelde's most important arguments in support of this opinion.

Like Kautsky, Vandervelde quotes Marx and Engels with great zeal, and like Kautsky, he quotes from Marx and Engels anything you like *except* what is absolutely unacceptable to the bourgeoisie and what distinguishes a revolutionary from a reformist. He speaks volubly about the conquest of political power by the proletariat, since practice has already confined this within strictly parliamentary limits. But as regards the fact that after the experience of the Paris Commune, Marx and Engels found it necessary to supplement the partially obsolete *Communist Manifesto* with an elucidation of the truth that the working class cannot simply lay hold of the ready-made state machinery, but must *smash* it—not a single word has he to say about that! Vandervelde and Kautsky, as if by agreement, pass over in complete silence what is most essential in the *experience* of the proletarian revolution, precisely that which distinguishes proletarian revolution from bourgeois reforms.

Like Kautsky, Vandervelde talks about the dictatorship of the proletariat only to dissociate himself from it. Kautsky did it by gross falsifications. Vandervelde does it in a more subtle way. In the part of his book, Section 4, on the subject of the "conquest of political power by the proletariat", he devotes sub-section *b* to the question of the "collective dictatorship of the proletariat", "quotes" Marx and Engels (I repeat: omitting precisely what pertains to the main point, namely, the *smashing* of the old, bourgeois-democratic state machine), and concludes:

"...In socialist circles, the social revolution is commonly conceived in the following manner: a new Commune, this time victorious, and not in one place but in the main centres of the capitalist world.

"A hypothesis, but a hypothesis which has nothing improbable about it at a time when it is becoming evident that the post-war period will see in many countries unprecedented class antagonisms and social convulsions.

"But if the failure of the Paris Commune, not to speak of the difficulties of the Russian revolution, proves anything at all, it proves that it is impossible to put an end to the capitalist system until the proletariat has sufficiently prepared itself to make proper use of the power the force of circumstances may place into its hands" (p. 73).

And absolutely nothing more on the point at issue!

Here they are, the leaders and representatives of the Second International! In 1912 they signed the Basle Manifesto, which explicitly speaks of the connection between that very war which broke out in 1914 and a proletarian revolution, and actually holds it up as a *threat*. And when the war broke out and a revolutionary situation arose, the Kautskys and Vanderveldes began to dissociate themselves from revolution. A revolution of the Paris Commune type is only a not improbable hypothesis! This is quite analogous to Kautsky's argument about the possible role of the Soviets in Europe.

But that is just the way every educated *liberal* argues; he will, no doubt, agree now that a new Commune is "not improbable", that the Soviets have a great role to play, etc. The proletarian revolutionary differs from the liberal precisely in that he, as a theoretician, analyses the new significance of the Commune and the Soviets *as a state*. Vandervelde, however, *passes over in silence* everything Marx and Engels said at such length on the subject when analysing the experience of the Paris Commune.

As a practical worker, as a politician, a Marxist should have made it clear that only traitors to socialism can now evade the task of elucidating the need for a proletarian revolution (of the Commune type, the Soviet type, or perhaps of some third type), of explaining the necessity of preparing for it, of conducting propaganda for revolution among the people, of refuting the petty-bourgeois prejudices against it, etc.

But neither Kautsky nor Vandervelde does anything of the sort, precisely because they themselves are traitors to socialism, who want to maintain their reputation as socialists and Marxists among the workers.

Take the theoretical formulation of the question.

The state, even in a democratic republic, is nothing but a machine for the suppression of one class by another. Kautsky is familiar with this truth, admits it, agrees with it, but ... he evades the fundamental question as to what particular class the proletariat must suppress when it establishes the proletarian state, for what reasons, and by what means.

Vandervelde is familiar with, admits, agrees with and quotes this fundamental proposition of Marxism (p. 72 of his book), but ... he does not say a single word on the "unpleasant" (for the capitalist gentlemen) subject of the *suppression of the resistance of the exploiters!*

Both Vandervelde and Kautsky have completely evaded this "unpleasant" subject. Therein lies their apostasy.

Like Kautsky, Vandervelde is a past master in the art of substituting eclecticism for dialectics. On the one hand it cannot but be admitted, and on the other hand it must be confessed. On the one hand, the term state may mean "the nation as a whole" (see Littré's dictionary—a learned work, it cannot be denied—and Vandervelde, p. 87); on the other hand, the term state may mean the "government" (*ibid.*). Vandervelde quotes this learned platitude, with approval, *side by side* with quotations from Marx.

The Marxist meaning of the word "state" differs from the ordinary meaning, writes Vandervelde. Hence, "misunderstandings" may arise. "Marx and Engels regard the state not as the state in the broad sense, not as an organ of guidance, as the representative of the general interests of society (*intérêts généraux de la société*). It is the state as the power, the state as the organ of authority, the state as the instrument of the rule of one class over another" (pp. 75-76 of Vandervelde's book).

Marx and Engels speak about the abolition of the state only in its second meaning.... "Too absolute affirmations run the risk of being inexact. There are many transitional stages between the capitalist state, which is based on the exclusive rule of one class, and the proletarian state, the aim of which is to abolish all classes" (p. 156).

There you have an example of Vandervelde's "manner", which is only slightly different from that of Kautsky's,

and, in essence, identical with it. Dialectics repudiate absolute truths and explain the successive changes of opposites and the significance of crises in history. The eclectic does not want propositions that are "too absolute", because he wants to push forward his philistine desire to substitute "*transitional stages*" for revolution.

The Kautskys and Vanderveldes say nothing about the fact that the transitional stage between the state as an organ of the rule of the capitalist class and the state as an organ of the rule of the proletariat is *revolution*, which means overthrowing the bourgeoisie and *breaking up, smashing, their state machine*.

The Kautskys and Vanderveldes obscure the fact that the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie must be replaced by the dictatorship of *one* class, the proletariat, and that the "*transitional stages*" of the *revolution* will be followed by the "*transitional stages*" of the gradual withering away of the proletarian state.

Therein lies their political apostasy.

Therein, theoretically, philosophically, lies their substitution of eclecticism and sophistry for dialectics. Dialectics are concrete and revolutionary and distinguish between the "*transition*" from the dictatorship of one class to the dictatorship of another and "*transition*" from the democratic proletarian state to the non-state ("the withering away of the state"). To please the bourgeoisie, the eclecticism and sophistry of the Kautskys and Vanderveldes blur all that is concrete and precise in the class struggle and advance instead the general concept "*transition*", under which they may hide (as *nine-tenths* of the official *Social-Democrats* of our time *do hide*) their renunciation of revolution!

As an eclectic and sophist, Vandervelde is more skilful and subtle than Kautsky; for the *phrase*, "*transition from the state in the narrow sense to the state in the broad sense*", can serve as a means of evading all and sundry problems of revolution, all the difference between revolution and reform, and even the difference between the Marxist and the liberal. For what bourgeois with European education would think of denying, "in general", "*transitional stages*" in this "general" sense?

Vandervelde writes:

"I agree with Guesde that it is impossible to socialise the means of production and exchange without the following two conditions having been fulfilled:

"1. The transformation of the present state as the organ of the rule of one class over another into what Menger calls a people's labour state, by the conquest of political power by the proletariat.

"2. Separation of the state as an organ of authority from the state as an organ of guidance, or, to use Saint-Simon's expression, of the government of men from the administration of things" (p. 89).

Vandervelde puts this in italics, laying special emphasis on the importance of these propositions. But this is a sheer eclectical hodge-podge, a complete rupture with Marxism! The "people's labour state" is just a paraphrase of the old "free people's state", which the German Social-Democrats paraded in the seventies and which Engels branded as an absurdity.¹³⁸ The term "people's labour state" is a phrase worthy of petty-bourgeois democrats (like our Left Socialist-Revolutionaries), a phrase which substitutes *non-class* concepts for class concepts. Vandervelde places the conquest of state power by the *proletariat* (by one *class*) alongside of the "people's" state, and fails to see that the result is a hodge-podge. With Kautsky and his "pure democracy", the result is a similar hodge-podge, and a similar anti-revolutionary, philistine disregard of the tasks of the class revolution, of the class, proletarian, dictatorship, of the *class* (proletarian) state.

Further, the government of men will disappear and give way to the administration of things only when the state *in all forms* withers away. But talking about this relatively distant future, Vandervelde overlays, obscures the task of *tomorrow*, namely, the *overthrow* of the bourgeoisie.

This trick is also equivalent to subserviency to the liberal bourgeoisie. The liberal is willing to talk about what will happen when it is not necessary to govern men. Why not indulge in such innocuous dreams? But about the proletariat having to crush the bourgeoisie's resistance to their expropriation—not a word. The class interests of the bourgeoisie demand it.

Socialism versus the State. This is Vandervelde's bow to the proletariat. It is not difficult to make a bow; every "democratic" politician knows how to make a bow to his

electors. And under cover of a "bow", an anti-revolutionary, anti-proletarian meaning is insinuated.

Vandervelde extensively paraphrases Ostrogorsky¹³⁹ to show what amount of deceit, violence, corruption, mendacity, hypocrisy and oppression of the poor is hidden beneath the civilised, polished and perfumed exterior of modern bourgeois democracy. But he draws no conclusion from this. He fails to notice that bourgeois democracy suppresses the working and exploited people and that *proletarian democracy* will have to *suppress the bourgeoisie*. Kautsky and Vandervelde are blind to this. The class interests of the bourgeoisie, in whose wake these petty-bourgeois traitors to Marxism are floundering, *demand* that this question be evaded, that it be hushed up, or that the necessity of such suppression be directly denied.

Petty-bourgeois eclecticism versus Marxism, sophistry versus dialectics, philistine reformism versus proletarian revolution—that should have been the title of Vandervelde's book.

DRAFT DECISION ON THE USE OF STATE CONTROL¹⁴⁰

On the question of using State Control for keeping a check on work and improving defence capacity, the majority on the commission have voted for lightning control, that is, dispatch of groups or commissions with wide powers to check on various institutions.

We must have concrete, factual, numerical data on the forces at our disposal (Party members first, then non-Party, but absolutely honest men) for exercising genuine control. We must know the number of specialists in the various branches; the number of those experienced in administration and management.

Tasks of control are of two kinds:

the very simple task of checking on warehouses, goods, etc.;

the more difficult one of checking on the efficiency of the work; combating sabotage, completely exposing it; checking on the way the work is being organised; ensuring the greatest *efficiency* of work, and so on.

No. 1 task is to improve work in the *Food and Communications* Commissariats.

Written December 3, 1918

Published according to
the manuscript

SPEECH TO THE MOSCOW GUBERNIA CONGRESS
OF SOVIETS, POOR PEASANTS' COMMITTEES
AND DISTRICT COMMITTEES OF THE RUSSIAN
COMMUNIST PARTY (BOLSHEVIKS)
DECEMBER 8, 1918
BRIEF NEWSPAPER REPORT

(Storm of applause.) Lenin began his speech by saying that events of the past few weeks in Austria and Germany had gone to show that in our estimation of the international situation we had been right to base our policy on a precise, lucid and proper account of all the consequences of the four-year war, which, from being a battle of capitalists for dividing up their spoils, had turned into a battle between them and the workers of the world. The revolution had had a hard time starting in Western Europe, but once it had done so it had been developing more rapidly, surely and orderly than ours.

Speaking of the labour movement in other countries which is coming to our aid Comrade Lenin called for an all-out effort and said that every month of our existence, which we were defending at so high a cost, was bringing us nearer to a lasting victory.

On the current task of re-elections to the volost and village Soviets, Comrade Lenin stressed that all the difficulties of independent organisation of the working people from below would be overcome when everyone realised that the government must rely on the workers and the poor and middle peasants, who are not our enemies, they are just wavering, and with the consolidation of the Soviet government they will side with us.

The cause we have begun, Lenin concluded, will be carried through by the workers of the whole world. (*Prolonged applause.*)

Izvestia No. 271,
December 11, 1918

Published according to
the *Izvestia* text

SPEECH TO THE THIRD WORKERS'
CO-OPERATIVE CONGRESS¹⁴¹
DECEMBER 9, 1918

(Stormy ovation.) Comrades, the workers' co-operatives are today faced with extremely important economic and political tasks. Both the one and the other are now part and parcel of the economic and political struggle. In respect of the immediate tasks I want to underline the meaning of "conciliation with the co-operatives". This conciliation, mentioned so frequently of late in the papers, radically differs from the conciliation with the bourgeoisie, which is nothing short of treachery. This conciliation we are talking about now is conciliation of a very special kind. There is a world of difference between the Soviet Government's conciliation with Germany which produced some results, and the conciliation—which would be harmful and even fatal to the country—of the working class with the bourgeoisie. What that pretext of conciliation amounts to is the complete betrayal both of the class struggle and the fundamentals of socialism. Socialists who are well aware that their chief task is to fight the bourgeoisie and capital appreciate this distinction.

All of us very well realise that there can only be one alternative in our class struggle: recognition either of the rule of capital or of the working class. We know that all the attempts by the petty-bourgeois parties to form and pursue their policy in the country are doomed to failure before they even start. We have clearly seen and experienced several attempts by various petty-bourgeois parties and groups to push through their policy, and we see that all attempts by intermediate forces are bound to end in failure. By virtue of the very

definite conditions there are only two central forces, standing at opposite ends of the pole, that can have a hold on Russia, can decide her fate one way or the other. I will go even further and say that the whole world is being formed and directed by one or the other of these central forces. As far as Russia is concerned I can say quite definitely that, because of the specific economic conditions, only one of these forces can take control. The rest, the intermediate forces, may be numerous but they can never count for much.

Right now, the Soviet authorities must face the question of conciliation with the co-operatives. In April we departed from our vowed intention and made concessions. Naturally enough, there should be no class co-operatives in a country where all classes are being eliminated, but, I repeat, the conditions of the time demanded a certain delay and we put it off for a few months. Nevertheless, we all realise that the Soviet government will never abandon the position it now occupies. We had to make those concessions since at that time we were alone in the whole world. Our concessions were due to the difficulties we had in our work. Because of the economic tasks which the proletariat had taken on, we had to reconcile ourselves to and preserve certain petty-bourgeois habits. The point here is that in one way or another we must ensure the guidance and coordination of the activity of the whole mass of working and exploited people. We must all the while bear in mind what the proletariat requires of us. A popular government must remember that the various sections of the petty bourgeoisie will more and more come over to the governing working class when they eventually see there is no choice, that all their hopes of a middle way of running the country are finally ruined. All the wonderful slogans about popular will, the Constituent Assembly and the like, which were a screen for all the half-measures, were immediately swept away the moment genuine popular will asserted itself. You can see for yourselves what happened and how all these slogans, the half-measure slogans, were scattered to the winds. At the given moment, we can see this happening throughout the whole world in revolution as well as in Russia.

I want to show you the difference between the conciliation which produced such an appalling disgust throughout

the working class, and the conciliation which we are now calling for, agreement with all the small peasants, all the petty bourgeoisie. At the time of the Brest-Litovsk Peace Treaty, when we accepted the harsh terms of the treaty, it was said there was no hope of a world revolution, nor could there be. We were quite alone in the world. We know that at that time many parties were repelled from us because of the treaty and joined the bourgeoisie. At that time we had to endure all sorts of terrible experiences. A few months later we saw there was and could be no choice, no middle way.

When the German revolution came, everyone realised that revolution was sweeping the whole world, that Britain, France and America were also going the same way—along our path! When our petty-bourgeois democrats followed their patrons, they did not realise where they were being led, they did not realise they were being led along the capitalist road. Now we see by the example of the German revolution that these representatives and patrons of democracy, these Wilsons and Co., are imposing worse treaties on a defeated nation than the Brest-Litovsk Treaty which was forced on us. It is quite clear to us that international demagogery is now bankrupt because of the events in the West and the new situation. Now the physiognomy of every nation is as clear as can be. Now, the masks have been torn off and all the illusions have been dispelled by the battering-ram of history.

It is natural that the Soviet government should have to use all its influence and weight with such waverers who are always around during a transition, so as to carry out tasks which we are now setting, tasks which back our policy begun in April. We then had to put off our vowed intentions for a while; then we consciously and openly made several concessions.

Someone asked about exactly where we stand on this road. Now the whole of Europe clearly sees that our revolution is no longer in the experimental stage; the attitude of the civilised nations to us has now changed. They now appreciate that in this respect we are doing something new and tremendous, that we have had so much trouble because for almost all the time we stood utterly alone and completely forsaken by the entire international proletariat. In this respect we have been guilty of many serious mistakes which we

do not in any way hide. We should, of course, have endeavoured to unite the whole population and not to divide them. We may not have done it up to now and we must get down to the job sometime. We have already joined up with many organisations. Now, the workers' co-operatives and Soviet bodies should be merged. Since this April we have been organising on the basis of experience and we have been employing the store of social and political forces that we have at our disposal. We have been organising the supply and distribution of goods among the whole population. We have checked every step we took because this organisation has been particularly difficult to carry out in our economically backward country. Agreements with the co-operatives were first made in April and the decree issued on the complete merger and organisation of supply and distribution pursues the same aim.

The previous speaker mentioned friction in a reference to Petrograd; we know there is friction almost everywhere. We also know that this friction is quite inevitable because the time has come when two utterly different types of apparatus are meeting and merging. We know too, however, that we have to pass through it because it is inevitable. In just the same way you must realise that the long resistance put up by the workers' co-operatives has finally resulted in distrust from the Soviet government, a distrust that is perfectly natural.

You say you want independence. It is quite natural that anyone who puts forward this demand should induce distrust. If you complain of friction and want to avoid it, then you must first give up the idea of independence since anyone who insists on that is an enemy of the Soviet government at a time when we are all striving for a closer union. Once the workers' co-operatives unite in a perfectly clear-cut, honest and open way with the Soviet government, this friction will begin to disappear. I know only too well that when two groups merge the work does not proceed smoothly at first. Nevertheless, with a little time, when the one group earns the trust of the other, all the friction gradually fades away. However, constant inter-departmental friction is likely if the two groups stay apart. I don't understand what independence has got to do with it. After all we all agree

that the whole of society should be one big co-operative as far as supply and distribution are concerned. All of us agree that the co-operatives are a socialist gain. There lies the immense difficulty of socialist gains. There lie the difficulty and aim of victory. Capitalism deliberately splits the population. This split must disappear once and for all, and the whole of society must become a single workers' co-operative. There can and must be no question of any kind of independence for individual groups.

To establish this type of co-operative I was speaking about just now is the condition for the victory of socialism. That is why we say that no matter what difference of opinion we may have over private matters, we shall never come to terms with capitalism or take any step away from the principles of our struggle. The agreement we are now going to make with sections of social classes is an agreement not with the bourgeoisie or capital, but with individual groups of workers and democrats. There is nothing to be afraid of in this agreement because the whole difference between these sections will disappear without a trace in the fire of revolution. Now all we need is a single will to enter with an open heart that single world co-operative. What the Soviet government and the co-operatives have done up to now must be merged. That is the substance of the latest decree passed by the Soviet government. That has been the approach by Soviet representatives in many places in the absence of our decree. The tremendous good accomplished by the co-operatives must be merged with the tremendous good accomplished by the Soviet government. All sections of the population fighting for their freedom must be merged in a single strong organisation. We know we have made a lot of mistakes, especially in the first months after the October Revolution. But from now onwards, after a passage of time, we shall endeavour to attain a complete union and complete agreement among the population. To do so, everything must come under the Soviet government and all illusions about some sort of "independence", whether for individual groups or the workers' co-operatives, must be dispelled as quickly as possible. Hopes for "independence" can only be held out where there can still be hopes for some sort of return to the past.

The Western nations once regarded us and all our revolutionary movement as a curiosity. They used to say: "Let the people have their fling; we shall wait and see how it all works out.... Queer people, those Russians!" Now the "queer Russians" have shown the world what their "fling" means. (*Applause.*)

Now that the German revolution has broken out, a foreign consul said to Zinoviev: "It's hard to say at this point who has made better use of the Brest-Litovsk Peace, you or we."

He said this because everyone was saying it. Everyone saw that this was just the beginning of the great world revolution. And this great revolution was started by the backward and "queer" Russian people.... History certainly has strange ways: that a backward country should have the honour of leading a great world movement, which is seen and understood by the bourgeoisie of the whole world. This conflagration has swept Germany, Belgium, Switzerland and Holland.

This movement is spreading from day to day, the revolutionary Soviet Government is daily gaining in strength. That is why the bourgeoisie have now taken an entirely different attitude to matters. Now that the axe is about to fall on world capitalism, there can be no question at all of any independence for individual parties. America provides the most glaring example. America is one of the most democratic countries, it is a great democratic social republic. Where else, if not in that country—which has all the electoral rights and all the rights of a free state—could we expect a correct solution to all legal questions? Yet we know what has happened to a clergyman there, in that democratic republic: he was tarred and whipped until his blood flowed in the dust. This took place in a free country, in a democratic republic. This was allowed to happen by the "humane", "philanthropic" Tiger Wilsons and Co. What are these Wilsons now doing with Germany, a defeated country? The pictures of world relations are displayed before us in full view! We see the substance of what the Wilsons offer their friends from these pictures, which carry such overwhelming conviction. The Wilsons would have instantly proved our point. These gentlemen—the free multimillionaires, the "most humane" people in the world—would have instantly

broken their friends' habit of talking, even of dreaming, of "independence" in any form. They would have squarely put before you the alternative: either you stand for the capitalist system or you stand for the Soviets. They would have said: do this, because we say so, we, your friends, the British, the Americans—the Wilsons, and the French—Clemenceau's friends.

That is why it is quite hopeless to expect any vestige of independence to remain. This cannot be, and it is no use dreaming of it. There can be no middle course once it is a question of protecting property on the one hand, and once the proletariat has found its way on the other. The branches of the tree of life must either be closely intertwined with capital, or even more closely with the Soviet Republic. It is absolutely clear to everyone that socialism has entered the period of its realisation. It is quite clear to everyone that it is absolutely impossible to maintain or retain petty-bourgeois positions through universal suffrage. The Wilsons may nurture such illusions, rather, they do not nurture such illusions but try to embellish their own aims by fostering such illusions, but you won't find many people nowadays who believe these fairy-tales. If such people do exist, they are a historical rarity or a museum piece. (*Applause.*)

The differences you have had from the outset about preserving the "independence" of the co-operative movement are nothing but vain efforts which must peter out without any hope of a positive solution. This struggle is not serious and it clashes with the principles of democracy. Although this is not surprising because the Wilsons are also "democrats". They say that it remains for them to establish one final union because they have so many dollars they can buy up the whole of Russia, and the whole of India, and the whole world. Wilson presides over their company, their pockets are bulging with dollars and that is why they talk about buying up Russia and India and everything else. But they forget that basic international issues are settled in an entirely different manner, that only some people, in a definite environment, may be impressed by their statements. They forget that the resolutions daily adopted by the strongest class in the world—the kind our own Congress is sure to adopt unanimously—greet only the dictatorship of the proletariat

all over the world. By adopting such a resolution our Congress takes the road which does not and cannot lead to the kind of "independence" being discussed here today. You are aware that Karl Liebknecht has shown some opposition not only to the petty-bourgeois peasants, but also to the co-operative movement. You know that just for this Scheidemann and company consider him a dreamer and fanatic, yet you addressed a message of greetings to him, just as you sent greetings to Maclean. By voicing solidarity on these matters with the great world leaders you have burnt your boats. You must keep a firm stand because at the moment you are standing up not only for yourselves, not only for your own rights, but also for the rights of Liebknecht and Maclean. I have often heard the Russian Mensheviks condemn conciliation, and inveigh against those who came to terms with the Kaiser's lackeys. Nor were the Mensheviks alone in erring that way. The whole world pointed at us, hurling this stern charge: "Conciliators." Now that the world revolution has started, and they have to deal with Haase and Kautsky, we have the right to describe our position in the words of the good Russian proverb: "Let's stand back, and see how well we are placed."

We know our shortcomings, and they are easily pointed out. But to the onlooker everything appears to be quite different from what it actually is. At one time, you know, everyone in the other parties condemned our behaviour and our policy, and now whole parties are siding with us, and want to work with us.¹⁴² The wheel of the world revolutionary movement has now turned to such an extent that we need not fear any kind of conciliation whatsoever. And I am sure that our Congress will find the right way out of the situation. There is only one way out: a merger of the co-operative movement with the Soviet government. You know that Britain, France, America and Spain regarded our actions as experiments; they have now changed their tune: they now have to look to their own affairs at home. Of course, physically, materially and financially they are considerably stronger than we are, but in spite of their outward polish we know they are rotten inside; they are stronger than we are at present with the strength that was Germany's when the Brest-Litovsk Peace Treaty was concluded. But what do we

see now? Everyone recoiled from us then. Now, every month we spend in strengthening the Soviet Republic we spend in defending not only ourselves, but also the cause started by Liebknecht and Maclean, and we already see that Britain, France, America and Spain have been infected with the same disease and are fired with the same flame as Germany, the flame of the universal and world-wide struggle of the working class against imperialism. (*Prolonged applause.*)

Brief report published in
Izvestia No. 270,
December 10, 1918

Published according to
the pamphlet checked
with the verbatim report

**SPEECH TO THE FIRST ALL-RUSSIA CONGRESS
OF LAND DEPARTMENTS,
POOR PEASANTS' COMMITTEES AND COMMUNES¹⁴
DECEMBER 11, 1918**

(Loud applause passing into ovation.) Comrades, the composition of this Congress, in my opinion, is in itself an indication of the profound change that has taken place and the great progress we, the Soviet Republic, have made in building socialism, in particular in agricultural relations, which are of the utmost importance to our country. This Congress consists of representatives of the land departments, the Poor Peasants' Committees and the agricultural communes, a combination which shows that within a short space of time, within a single year, our revolution has made great strides in recasting those relations that are the most difficult to recast and which in all previous revolutions constituted the greatest hindrance to the cause of socialism, but which must be most fully recast to ensure the triumph of socialism.

The first stage in the development of our revolution since October was mainly devoted to defeating the common enemy of all the peasants, the landowners.

Comrades, you are all very well aware that even the February Revolution—the revolution of the bourgeoisie, the revolution of the compromisers—promised the peasants victory over the landowners, and that this promise was not fulfilled. Only the October Revolution, only the victory of the urban working class, only the Soviet government could relieve the whole of Russia, from end to end, of the ulcer of the old feudal heritage, the old feudal exploitation, landed estates and the landowners' oppression of the peasants as a whole, of all peasants without distinction.

This fight against the landowners was one in which all the peasants were bound to participate, and participate they did. The fight united the poor peasants, who do not live by exploiting the labour of others. But it also united the most prosperous and even wealthy peasants, who cannot get along without hired labour.

As long as our revolution was occupied with this task, as long as we had to exert every effort for the independent movement of the peasants, aided by the urban workers' movement, to sweep away and completely destroy the power of the landowners, the revolution remained a general peasant revolution and could therefore not go beyond bourgeois limits.

It had still not touched the more powerful and more modern enemy of all working people—capital. It therefore ran the risk of ending halfway, like the majority of the revolutions in Western Europe, in which a temporary alliance of the urban workers and all the peasants succeeded in sweeping away the monarchy and the survivals of medievalism, in more or less thoroughly sweeping away the landed estates or the power of the landowners, but never succeeded in undermining the actual foundations of the power of capital.

Our revolution began to tackle this much more important and much more difficult task this summer and autumn. The wave of counter-revolutionary uprisings which arose this summer—when the attack of the West-European imperialists and their Czech hirelings on Russia was joined by all the exploiting and oppressing elements in Russian life— injected a new spirit and fresh life in the countryside.

In practice, all these revolts united the European imperialists, their Czech hirelings, and all those in Russia who remained on the side of the landowners and capitalists, united them in a desperate struggle against the Soviet government. These revolts were followed by the revolt of all the village kulaks.

The village was no longer united. The peasants, who had fought as one man against the landowners, now split into two camps—the camp of the more prosperous peasants and the camp of the poor peasants who, side by side with the workers, continued their steadfast advance towards socialism

and changed from fighting the landowners to fighting capital, the power of money, and the use of the great land reform for the benefit of the kulaks. This struggle cut the property-owning and exploiting classes off from the revolution completely; it definitely put our revolution on the socialist road which the urban working class had tried so hard and vigorously to put it on in October, but along which it will not be able to direct the revolution successfully unless it finds firm, deliberate and solid support in the countryside.

There lies the significance of the revolution which took place this summer and autumn even in the most remote villages of Russia, a revolution which was not spectacular, not as striking and obvious as the October Revolution of last year, but whose significance is incomparably deeper and greater.

The formation of the Poor Peasants' Committees in the rural districts was the turning-point; it showed that the urban working class, which in October had united with all the peasants to crush the landowners, the principal enemy of the free, socialist Russia of the working people, had progressed from this to the much more difficult and historically more noble and truly socialist task—that of carrying the enlightening socialist struggle into the rural districts, and reaching the minds of the peasants as well. The great agrarian revolution—proclamation in October of the abolition of private ownership of land, proclamation of the socialisation of the land—would have inevitably remained a paper revolution if the urban workers had not stirred into action the rural proletariat, the poor peasants, the working peasants, who constitute the vast majority. Like the middle peasants, they do not exploit the labour of others and are not interested in exploitation. They are therefore capable of advancing, and have already advanced, beyond the joint struggle against the landowners to the general proletarian struggle against capital, against the rule of the exploiters, who rely on the power of money and property. They have progressed from sweeping Russia clean of landowners to establishing a socialist system.

This, comrades, was an extremely difficult step to take. Those who doubted the socialist character of our revolution

prophesied that this is where we were bound to slip up. Today, however, socialist construction in the countryside depends entirely on this step. The formation of the Poor Peasants' Committees, their wide network throughout Russia, their coming conversion, which in part has already begun, into fully competent rural Soviets that will have to put the fundamental principles of Soviet organisation, the power of the working people, into effect in the rural districts, constitute a real guarantee that we have gone further than the tasks to which ordinary bourgeois-democratic revolutions in West-European countries confined themselves. We have destroyed the monarchy and the medieval power of the land-owners, and we are now getting down to the real work of building socialism. This is the most difficult but at the same time the most important and very rewarding work in the countryside. We have got through to the working peasants right in the villages; the wave of capitalist revolts has completely turned them against the capitalist class; the peasants in the Poor Peasants' Committees and in the Soviets which are now undergoing changes are more and more joining forces with the urban workers. In all this we see the sole, yet true and undoubtedly permanent guarantee that socialist development in Russia has now become more stable, and has now acquired a basis among the vast mass of the agricultural population.

There is no doubt that building socialism is a very difficult job in a peasant country like Russia. There is no doubt that it was comparatively easy to sweep away an enemy like tsarism, the power of the landowners, the landed estates. At the centre the job could be done in a few days; throughout the country it could be done in a few weeks. But, by its very nature, the task we are now tackling can be accomplished only by extremely persistent and sustained effort. Here we shall have to fight our way step by step, inch by inch. We shall have to fight for every achievement to win a new, socialist Russia; we shall have to fight for collective farming.

It goes without saying that a revolution of this kind, the transition from small individual peasant farms to collective farming, will take some time and can certainly not be accomplished at one stroke.

We know very well that in countries where small peasant farming prevails the transition to socialism cannot be effected except by a series of gradual, preliminary stages. In the light of this, the first aim set by the October Revolution was merely to overthrow and destroy the landowners' power. The February fundamental law on the socialisation of the land, which, as you know, was passed unanimously both by Communists and the non-Communist partners of the Soviet government, was at the same time an expression of the conscious will of the vast majority of the peasants and proof that the working class, the workers' Communist Party, aware of their task, are persistently and patiently advancing towards the new socialist construction—advancing by a series of gradual measures, by awakening the working peasants, and forging ahead only in step with that awakening, only insofar as the peasants are independently organised.

We fully realise that such tremendous changes in the lives of tens of millions of people as the transition from small individual peasant farming to collective farming, affecting as they do the most deep-going roots of the peasants' way of life and their mores, can only be accomplished by long effort, and only when necessity compels people to reshape their lives.

After the long and desperate world war, we can clearly discern the beginnings of a socialist revolution all over the world. This has become a necessity for even the more backward countries and—irrespective of any theoretical views or socialist doctrines—is emphatically bringing it home to everybody that it is impossible to live in the old way.

The country has suffered tremendous ruin and disruption, and we see this disruption spreading all over the world, we see many centuries of man's cultural, scientific and technological achievements swept away in these four years of criminal, destructive and predatory war, and the whole of Europe, not merely Russia alone, returning to a state of barbarism. Now, all common people, particularly the peasants, who have probably suffered most from the war, are coming to realise clearly enough that tremendous efforts are required, that every ounce of energy must be exerted to

get rid of the legacy of this accursed war which has left us nothing but ruin and want. It is impossible to live in the old way, in the way we lived before the war, and the waste of human toil and effort associated with individual small-scale peasant farming cannot continue. The productivity of labour would be doubled or trebled, there would be a double or triple saving of human labour in agriculture and human activity in general if a transition were made from this scattered small-scale farming to collective farming.

The ruination left by the war simply does not allow us to restore the old small-scale peasant farms. Not only have the mass of the peasants been awakened by the war, not only has the war shown them what technical marvels now exist and how these marvels have been adapted for people's extermination, but it has also given rise to the idea that these technical marvels must be used primarily to reshape agriculture, the most common form of production in the country, in which the greatest number of people are engaged, but which at the same time is the most backward. Not only has this idea been provoked, but the monstrous horrors of modern warfare have made people realise what forces modern technology has created, how these forces are wasted in awful and senseless war, and that it is the forces of technology themselves that are the only means of salvation from such horrors. It is our obligation and duty to use these forces to give new life to the most backward form of production, agriculture, to reshape it, and to transform it from production conducted in the old, unenlightened way, into production based on science and technical achievements. The war has made people realise this much more than any of us can imagine. But besides this the war has also made it impossible to restore production in the old way.

Those who cherish the hope that after this war the pre-war situation can be restored, that the old system and farming methods can be resumed, are mistaken and are coming to realise their mistake more and more every day. The war has resulted in such terrible ruin that some small farms now possess no draught animals or implements. We cannot allow the waste of people's labour to continue. The poor peasants, who have borne the greatest sacrifices for the revolution and suffered most from the war, did not take the land from the

landowners for it to fall into the hands of new kulaks. The latest developments are now confronting these peasants with the question of turning to collective farming as the only means of restoring the agriculture that has been ruined and destroyed by the war. This is the only means of escaping from ignorance and oppression to which capitalism doomed the entire rural population, due to which the capitalists were able for four years to burden mankind with war and from which the working people of all countries are now striving with revolutionary energy and fervour to rid themselves at all costs.

These, comrades, are the conditions that were required on a world scale for this most difficult and at the same time most important socialist reform, this crucial and fundamental socialist measure, to come to the forefront, and it has come to the forefront in Russia. The formation of the Poor Peasants' Committees and this joint Congress of land departments, Poor Peasants' Committees and agricultural communes, taken in conjunction with the struggle which took place in the countryside this summer and autumn, go to show that very many peasants have been awakened, and that the peasants themselves, the majority of the working peasants, are striving toward collective farming. Of course, I repeat, we must tackle this great reform gradually. Here, nothing can be done at one stroke. But I must remind you that the fundamental law on the socialisation of the land, whose adoption was a foregone conclusion on the first day after the Revolution of October 25, at the very first session of the first organ of Soviet power, the Second All-Russia Congress of Soviets, did more than abolish private ownership of land for ever and do away with landed estates. It also stipulated, among other things, that farm property, draught animals and farm implements which passed into the possession of the nation and the working peasants should become public property and cease to be the private property of individual farms. And on the fundamental question of our present aims, of what tasks of land disposal we want carried out, and what we want from the supporters of the Soviet government, the working peasants, in this respect, Article 11 of the law on the socialisation of the land, which was adopted in February 1918, states that the aim is to develop collective

farming, the most advantageous form of farming from the point of view of economy of labour and products. This will be at the expense of individual farming and with the aim of passing over to socialist farming.

Comrades, when we passed this law, complete agreement did not exist between the Communists and the other parties. On the contrary, we passed this law when the Soviet Government united the Communists and the Left S.R. Party members, who did not hold communist views. Nevertheless, we arrived at a unanimous decision, to which we adhere to this day, remembering, I repeat, that the transition from individual farming to collective farming cannot be effected at one stroke, and that the struggle which developed in the towns was resolved more easily. In the towns thousands of workers had one capitalist to deal with, and it did not take much trouble to remove him. The struggle which developed in the rural districts, however, was much more complex. At first there was the general drive of the peasants against the landowners; at first the power of the landowners was utterly destroyed so that it could never be restored again. This was followed by a struggle among the peasants themselves, among whom new capitalists arose in the shape of the kulaks, the exploiters and profiteers who used their surplus grain to enrich themselves at the expense of the starving non-agricultural parts of Russia. Here a new struggle began, and you know that this summer it led to a number of revolts. We do not say of the kulak as we do of the capitalist landowner that he must be deprived of all his property. What we do say is that we must break the kulak's resistance to indispensable measures, such as the grain monopoly, which he is violating to enrich himself by selling his grain surplus at exorbitant prices, while the workers and peasants in the non-agricultural areas are suffering pangs of hunger. Our policy here has been to wage a struggle as merciless as that waged against the landowners and capitalists. But there also remained the question of the attitude of the poor peasants to the middle peasants. Our policy has always been to form an alliance with the middle peasant. He is no enemy of Soviet institutions. He is no enemy of the proletariat or socialism. He will, of course, hesitate and only consent to socialism when he sees by

definite and convincing example that it is necessary. The middle peasant, of course, cannot be convinced by theoretical arguments or by agitation. And we do not count on that. But he can be convinced by the example and the solid front of the poor peasants. He can be convinced by an alliance of the poor peasants with the proletariat. And here we are counting on a prolonged and gradual process of persuasion and on a number of transitional measures which will bring about agreement between the proletarian, socialist section of the population, agreement between the Communists who are conducting a resolute fight against capital in all its forms, and the middle peasants.

Appreciating this state of affairs and that our task in the rural areas is incomparably more difficult, we present the question in the way it was presented in the law on the socialisation of the land. You know that the law proclaimed abolition of private ownership of land and equal land tenure, and you know that the enforcement of this law was begun in that spirit, and that it has been put into effect in the majority of rural areas. The law, moreover, contains, with the unanimous consent both of Communists and of people who at that time did not yet share communist views, the thesis I have just read to you, which declares that our common task and our common aim is the transition to socialist farming, to collective land tenure and collective farming. As we proceed with our construction, both the peasants who have already settled on the land and the prisoners of war who are now returning from captivity in thousands and millions, ragged and exhausted, are coming to realise more and more clearly the vast scope of the work that must be done to restore agriculture and free the peasant for ever from his old, neglected, downtrodden and ignorant state. It is becoming clearer to them that the only sure way of escape, one that will bring the mass of peasants nearer to a civilised life and put them on a par with other citizens, is collective farming, which the Soviet government is now systematically striving to put into effect by gradual measures. It is for this purpose, for collective farming, that the communes and state farms are being formed. The importance of this type of farming is indicated in the law on the socialisation of the land. In the clause stating who is entitled to the use of the

land, you will find that among the persons and institutions so entitled first place is given to the state, second to public organisations, third to agricultural communes, and fourth to agricultural co-operative societies. I again draw your attention to the fact that these fundamental principles of the law on the socialisation of the land were laid down when the Communist Party was carrying out not only its own will, but when it made deliberate concessions to those who in one way or another expressed the ideas and will of the middle peasants. We made such concessions, and are still making them. We concluded and are concluding agreements of this kind because the transition to the collective form of landownership, to collective farming, to state farms, to communes, cannot be effected at one stroke. It requires the determined and persistent action of the Soviet government, which has assigned one thousand million rubles for the improvement of agriculture on condition that collective farming is adopted. This law shows that we want to influence the mass of middle peasants mainly by force of example, by inviting them to improve farming, and that we count only on the gradual effect of such measures to bring about this profound and crucial revolution in agricultural production in Russia.

The alliance of the Poor Peasants' Committees, agricultural communes and land departments at the present Congress shows us, and gives us full assurance, that by this transition to collective farming we have got things going correctly, on a truly socialist scale. This steady and systematic work must ensure an increase in the productivity of labour. For this purpose we must adopt the best farming methods and enlist the farm specialists of Russia so that we may be able to put the best organised farms at our service, which hitherto served as a source of enrichment for individuals, as the source of capitalist revival, as the source of a new bondage and a new enslavement of wage-labourers, but which now, under the socialisation of land law and the complete abolition of private ownership of land, must serve as a source of agricultural knowledge and culture and of higher productivity for the millions of working people. This alliance between the urban workers and the working peasants, the formation of the Poor Peasants' Committees and their merger with the Soviets are a guarantee that

agricultural Russia has taken a path which is being taken by one West-European state after another, later than us, but with greater certainty. It was much harder for them to start the revolution because their enemy was not a rotten autocracy, but a highly cultured and united capitalist class. But, as you know, this revolution has begun. You know that the revolution has not been confined to Russia, and that our chief hope, our chief support, is the proletariat of the more advanced countries of Western Europe, and that this chief support of the world revolution has begun to move. And we are firmly convinced, and the course of the German revolution has shown it in practice, that the transition to socialist farming there, the use of more advanced agricultural techniques and the union of the agricultural population will proceed more rapidly and easily than in our country.

In alliance with the urban workers and the socialist proletariat of the whole world, the working peasants of Russia can now be certain they will overcome all their adversities, beat off all the attacks of the imperialists, and accomplish that without which the emancipation of the working people is impossible—collective farming, the gradual but steady transition from small individual farms to collective farming. (*Loud, prolonged applause.*)

Pravda No. 272,
December 14, 1918

Published according to
the *Pravda* text

**ROUGH DRAFT OF RULES
FOR THE ADMINISTRATION OF SOVIET
INSTITUTIONS¹⁴⁴**

1

Collective discussion and decision of all questions of administration in Soviet institutions must be accompanied by the precisely defined *responsibility of every person* holding any Soviet post for the *performance of definite, and clearly and explicitly specified, functions and practical jobs*.

Henceforth, this rule, without which it will be impossible to select the most suitable people for each office and job or to exercise effective control, must be *unreservedly obeyed*.

Accordingly, every Soviet body and every Soviet institution without exception shall immediately:

First, adopt a decision precisely distributing the work and responsibilities among all their members or officials;

Second, define the exact responsibility of all persons entrusted with the performance of any duties whatever, especially such as concern the speedy and proper collection and distribution of materials and products.

This rule is binding on all Soviet institutions, and in particular on local, uyezd, urban and other Economic Councils and Economic Departments of Executive Committees. Such Departments and Economic Councils shall immediately assign responsibility to definite persons for the speedy and proper collection of *each* of the raw materials and products needed by the population.

All leading Soviet bodies—Executive Committees, gubernia and city Soviets, etc.—shall immediately reorganise

their work with a view to giving prime place to effective control for actual fulfilment of the decisions of the central authorities and of local institutions. Other kinds of work are to be turned over, as far as possible, to sub-committees consisting of a small number of members of the given body.

2

With a view to eliminating red tape and to the more effective disclosure of abuses, and also to the exposure and removal of dishonest officials ensconced in Soviet institutions, the following rules are hereby established:

Every Soviet institution shall post notices of its reception days and hours outside as well as inside its premises, for all to see without having to obtain passes. The premises assigned for the reception of the public shall be freely accessible without any passes whatever.

Every Soviet institution shall keep a register for recording in brief the name of every visitor, the nature of his business, and to whom it has been entrusted.

Sundays and holidays shall be reception days.

State Control officials shall have the right to be present at all receptions, and it shall be their duty to attend from time to time during reception hours, to examine the visitors' register, and to draw up a report of their visit and the result of their examination of the register and interrogation of the public.

The Commissariats of Labour, State Control and Justice shall everywhere organise information bureaus, which shall be open to all without passes and free of charge, reception on Sundays being compulsory; the said Commissariats shall widely announce to the public the days and hours the bureaus are open.

It shall be the duty of these information bureaus, not only to give all information requested, orally or in writing, but also to draw up written declarations free of charge for persons who are illiterate or unable to draw up such declarations properly themselves. It shall be obligatory to enlist the services for work on these bureaus of members of *all* parties

represented on the Soviets, as well as of parties which are not represented in the government, and also members of the non-party trade unions and non-party unions of intellectuals.

3

The task of defending the Soviet Republic imperatively calls for the greatest economy of forces and the most productive utilisation of manpower.

With these ends in view it is ordered—in the first place in regard to all Soviet institutions, later to be extended to every enterprise and body—that:

1. Every more or less independent department of every Soviet institution without exception shall within three days submit to the local Executive Committee (and in Moscow to the People's Commissariat of Justice as well) brief information on the following: (a) name of institution; (b) name of department; (c) nature of its work, in brief; (d) number of sub-departments, sections, or other divisions, with a list of such; (e) number of employees, male and female; (f) volume of work, calculated as far as possible, for example, in number of cases handled, volume of correspondence, or other indices.

Local Executive Committees (in Moscow, the Executive Committee of the Soviet of Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Deputies in agreement with the People's Commissariat of Justice and the Presidium of the Central Executive Committee) shall immediately: (1) take measures to verify whether the above rule is being promptly and properly observed; (2) draw up within one week after the aforesaid information has been received a plan for coordinating, uniting and *merging* departments which are engaged in similar or kindred affairs.

The commissions which the above-mentioned institutions charge with this task shall include representatives of the Departments for the Interior, Justice, State Control and Labour, as well as of other departments, if need be. The commissions shall submit to the Council of People's Commissars and the Presidium of the Central Executive Committee brief *weekly* reports on what has been done to merge kindred departments and to economise labour.

2. In every town in which there are kindred departments or institutions—central, regional, town, gubernia or uyezd—the highest institution shall immediately set up a commission for the purpose of coordinating and amalgamating all these institutions, with a view to the maximum economy of forces; this commission to be guided by the rules and schedule indicated in Clause 1.

3. These same commissions (clauses 1 and 2) are instructed, and on the same grounds, to take urgent measures to substitute female labour for male labour to the utmost and to draw up a list of males who can be transferred to work in the army or for the army, or to other work of an operative and practical and not of an office nature.

4. These same commissions (clauses 1 and 2) are instructed, in agreement with the local organisations of the Russian Communist Party, to make such alteration in staffs as to leave members of the R.C.P. (of not less than two years' standing) only in leading and responsible posts; all other posts to be filled by non-Party people, or by members of other parties, so as to release as large a number of members of the R.C.P. as possible for other work.

Written December 12, 1918

Published according to
the manuscript

DRAFT DECISION OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE RUSSIAN COMMUNIST PARTY (BOLSHEVIKS)

All organisations of the R.C.P. shall within one week of publication of the present decision of the Central Committee of the R.C.P. enter on all membership and registration cards *the date* on which the respective members joined the Bolshevik Party.

In the absence of this information, and if it is impossible to obtain (and to have it verified and signed by not less than three members of the R.C.P. of two years' standing and over), such membership or registration cards shall be marked: "Date of joining the Party unknown."

Every member of the R.C.P. holding any Soviet post must immediately make a brief entry into his membership card stating what parties he belonged to, or was associated with, over the past *five* years, the entry to be certified by the chairman or secretary of his Party organisation.

Written December 12, 1918

Published according to
the manuscript

**SPEECH AT A PRESNYA DISTRICT WORKERS'
CONFERENCE
DECEMBER 14, 1918**

Comrades, I am going to examine a couple of questions fixed for discussion today. The first concerns the international situation and the second our attitude to the petty-bourgeois democratic parties.

First a few words about the international situation. As you know, the British, French and American imperialists have declared a grand campaign against the Russian Soviet Republic. These imperialists are carrying on agitation against Russia among their workers, accusing the Bolsheviks of flouting the majority and being propped up by a minority. Since the vast majority of papers in France and Britain belong to the bourgeoisie, these lies against the Soviet Government spread quickly and freely. That is why it is not worth even bothering about such a ridiculous and crude story that the Bolsheviks are backed by the minority of the people in Russia. It is a story that is not even worth refuting because everyone who knows anything about what is going on here realises how ridiculous it is. Yet when you look at the British, French and American papers—and, by the way, we only get the bourgeois papers here—you see the bourgeoisie are still spreading these tales.

The only people who have no voting rights and no right to take part in or influence the country's political life are exploiters, those who exploit the labour of others and do not work themselves. There are only a handful of such people among the population. You can just imagine how many people are exploiting hired labour in the towns. Private ownership of land is no more. The landowners have been deprived

of their estates and the homesteaders,¹⁴⁵ who were still robbing the peasants under Stolypin, have had their land taken away. The number of those exploiting other people's labour in the countryside is negligible too. But the Soviet government has not told them it will take their vote away. It has said that we recognise anyone's right to participate in administration if he wants to stop exploiting other people's labour. If you want to be a worker, God bless you. If you want to be an exploiter, we shall not only disfranchise you, but we shan't let you feed off someone else's labour.

From these fundamentals of our Constitution it is apparent that the Soviet government relies on those who work and offers them the right to run the country. The government is relying on the vast, overwhelming majority of the people. Every Soviet congress, and there have been six so far, shows us that the workers', peasants' and Red Army representatives, representatives of the majority of people who live by their own and not someone else's labour, constitute an increasingly solid foundation for the Soviet government. The First Congress of Soviets was held in June 1917, when Russia was a bourgeois republic engaged in an imperialist war. It took place in the June of 1917 when Kerensky was driving the troops on to the offensive and millions were killed in battle. At that Congress the number of Communists or Bolsheviks was only 13 per cent, that is one-seventh. At the Second Congress of Soviets which paved the way for the workers' and peasants' government, the Bolsheviks had jumped to 51 per cent, a half. And at the Fifth Congress this July the Bolsheviks had 66 per cent. It was then that the Left S.R.s, seeing how quickly Bolshevism was growing, tried their rash action and in so doing split apart completely. Three different parties arose from this split, of which the last one, the Narodnik Communists, came over to the Bolsheviks along with a whole number of prominent individuals like Kolegayev.

At the Sixth Congress, the Bolsheviks had 97 per cent, that is, practically all representatives of the workers and peasants of the whole of Russia. This is an indication of the present unity of the vast majority of working people around the Soviet government, and how stupid and ridiculous is the bourgeoisie's fairy-tale about the Bolsheviks

only having minority support. The bourgeoisie lie like they do because of the 17 thousand million debt of the tsarist government to the capitalists, the 17 thousand million debt which we repudiated and refused to pay. We don't intend to pay for the old rulers. We recognise that the debts have been incurred but we say: "Fair enough, you made the debt, you settle up among yourselves." The Allies want to get their own back on us for the debt and restore the power of the landowners and the tsar. We know what they did in Archangel, Samara and Siberia. There, even the Mensheviks and Right S.R.s., who were antagonistic after the Brest-Litovsk Peace Treaty and thought we were wrong to count on a German revolution, are now convinced of being driven out and of private property and the landowners being restored with the aid of British and Czech troops.

Even though the British and French papers hide the truth, it seems to be making some headway. The workers sense and realise that the revolution in Russia is theirs, a working-man's, socialist revolution. Even in France and Britain the labour movement is now carrying such slogans as "Withdraw the forces from Russia!" and "He who makes war against Russia is a criminal!" A socialist rally was recently held in London's Albert Hall and according to information received, which the British Government tried hard to repress, the rally demanded "Withdraw the forces from Russia!" and all the workers' leaders condemned the government policy as robbery and violence. We also have news that Maclean, who was a Scottish schoolmaster at one time, called the workers out on strike in the principal industrial districts, condemning the war as a war of plunder. He had been in prison earlier. Then he was put in again. But when the revolutionary movement flared up in Europe, Maclean was let out and he put up as parliamentary candidate in Glasgow, one of the biggest cities in the North of England and Scotland. This shows that the British labour movement and its revolutionary demands are having a bigger impact. The British Government was forced to set Maclean free, its rabid enemy, a man who is proud to call himself a British Bolshevik.

In France, where the workers are still affected by chauvinism, and where they still think the war is being waged only for the defence of the country, a revolutionary mood is

growing. Now, when Britain and France have beaten the Germans, they, as you know, have presented them with terms a hundred times harsher than those of the Brest-Litovsk Peace Treaty. Today, revolution in Europe has become a reality. The Allies, who boasted they were bringing Germany freedom from the Kaiser and militarism, have fallen to the role once played by the Russian troops in Nicholas I's time, when Russia was in the dark, when Nicholas I drove the Russian troops to stifle the Hungarian revolution. That was under serfdom over 60 years ago. Yet today, free Britain and other countries have turned into hangmen and think they are strong enough to stifle the revolution and repress the truth. But this truth will overcome all the obstacles both in France and Britain, and the workers will realise they have been deceived and inveigled into a war for robbing another country, and not for freeing France or Britain. From France we now hear there are people in the Socialist Party, which had previously supported defence of the fatherland, who warmly welcome the Soviet Republic and protest against military intervention in Russia.

On the other hand, the British and French imperialists are menacing Russia and giving support to the Krasnovs and Dutovs, helping to restore the monarchy and thinking they can deceive a free nation. We know that militarily the imperialists are stronger than us. We knew about it and said so ages ago. We appealed to everyone to aid the Red Army so as to bar the way to and repel the robbers and plunderers. When people say: "If British and French imperialism is stronger, what's the sense in fighting?" we reply: "Do you remember the Brest-Litovsk Treaty? Didn't the whole Russian bourgeoisie shout that the Bolsheviks were selling Russia to the Germans? Didn't they shout then that the Bolsheviks were hoping for a miracle in banking on a German revolution?" The German imperialists were then much stronger than us and had every chance of plundering Russia because we had no army. The old army could not and would not fight because people were so exhausted by the war that they just could not summon up the strength to fight. Everyone who knows what happened then realises that we could not defend ourselves and it looked like Russia was going to fall into the hands of the Kaiser's henchmen.

Yet, a few months later, the Germans had got themselves into such a mess in this same Russia and met such resistance, had so much trouble with the agitation among the German soldiers that now, as I was told by Zinoviev, Chairman of the Northern Commune in Petrograd, the German consul said as the German representatives were making off: "Now it's hard to tell who gained more, you or we." He realised that the German soldiers, who had been so much stronger than us, had been infected by the Bolshevik disease. And Germany today is in the grip of a revolution, there is a battle going on for Soviet power. The Brest-Litovsk Treaty, which had been declared the complete downfall of the Bolsheviks, turned out to be only a stepping stone to our present position. Having fortified ourselves we have now begun to form a Red Army. Yet the German soldiers have been infected by Bolshevism and the apparent victories turned out to be only a step to the complete downfall of German imperialism, an intermediate rung towards extending and developing the world revolution.

We were alone at the time of the Brest-Litovsk Treaty. All Europe looked on the Russian revolution as an exceptional affair, they regarded our revolution as an "Asiatic revolution", which began so hastily and toppled the tsar just because Russia was a backward country, and quickly moved on to take away property and to a socialist revolution because of this backwardness. But they forgot the other reason behind the Russian revolution: Russia had no alternative. The war had caused such destruction and starvation everywhere, made the people and soldiers so weary, they realised they had been tricked for so long, and that the only way out for Russia was revolution.

The Germans were told they had to defend themselves against the Russian invasion. And now this lie is being nailed with every passing day. The German capitalists and generals continued to lead their troops against Russia even when the country had become socialist. This made it quite clear to even the dimmest German soldier that he had been tricked for the whole four years and sent to war so that the German capitalists could plunder Russia. The same thing that brought the downfall of German imperialism, and the revolution in Germany, is with every passing day and hour bringing

the revolution closer in France, Britain and other countries. We were alone. Now we are not. Today, there is a revolution in Berlin, Austria, Hungary; even in Switzerland, Holland and Denmark, free countries that were not touched by the war, the revolutionary movement is growing and the workers are demanding that Soviets be formed. Now it seems there is no alternative. Revolution is maturing all over the world. We were the first and we must defend the revolution until our allies, the workers of all Europe, catch us up. The further their governments get into the mire, the closer these allies will be to us.

When at the time of the Brest-Litovsk Treaty the Germans thought they were the masters, they were only a step away from their doom. And today, Britain and France, by imposing peace terms on the Germans which are far harsher and more despicable than those Germany foisted on us, are standing on the edge of a precipice. No matter how much they lie, they are now only a few steps away from their doom. They are scared stiff of this doom, their lies are being increasingly exposed as the days go by. We say this: however much these imperialists lie in their newspapers, our cause is sound, much sounder than theirs because it is backed by the class-consciousness of the mass of workers everywhere; this class-consciousness was born of the war, which bled the whole world white for four years. The old governments will not enter God's world from this war. The old governments now say they are against world Bolshevism. The workers know what is going on in Russia: the landowners and capitalists are being hounded out, and are calling hirelings, alien soldiers to the rescue. The situation is now clear to everyone. Workers everywhere realise what is going on. And despite the whole savagery and bitterness of the imperialists, we courageously go into battle with them in the awareness that every step they take inside Russia will be a step towards their doom, and that they will fare no better than the German soldiers who brought Bolshevism back from the Ukraine instead of bread.

Power in Russia is now in the hands of the working people; if they lose it, nobody will ever be able to heal the wounds caused by this bloody, terrible war! To leave power in the hands of the old capitalists would mean that the whole

burden of war would have to be shouldered by the working people, who would have to pay the entire cost.

Britain, America and Japan are now fighting for a share of the spoils. Everything has been divided. Wilson is President of the world's most democratic republic. But what is he saying? People there are shot in the streets by jingoist crowds for one word in favour of peace. A clergyman who had never been a revolutionary was dragged out into the street and severely beaten for preaching peace. Where the wildest terror reigns troops are now being used to crush the revolution, to threaten suppression of the German revolution. The revolution in Germany broke out just recently, only a month ago; the burning issue there is a Constituent Assembly or Soviet government. All the bourgeoisie there are for the Constituent Assembly, and all the socialists—those who served the Kaiser as lackeys, who did not dare start a revolutionary war—they, too, want a Constituent Assembly. Germany is split into two camps. The socialists now favour the Constituent Assembly, while Liebknecht, who spent three years in prison, stands, like Rosa Luxemburg, at the head of *Die Rote Fahne*.¹⁴⁶ An issue of the newspaper was received in Moscow yesterday. It had a very difficult and eventful journey. In it you will find a number of articles—all the authors, who are revolutionary leaders, describe how the bourgeoisie are cheating the people. Freedom in Germany was in the hands of the capitalists. They published only their own newspapers, and now *Die Rote Fahne* says that only the workers have the right to use national wealth. Although the revolution in Germany is only a month old, the country is split into two camps. All the traitor socialists are clamouring for a Constituent Assembly, while the genuine, honest socialists are saying: "We all stand for the power of the workers and the soldiers." They are not saying "and the peasants", because in Germany many peasants also hire labourers, and so they are saying "for the workers and the soldiers". They say instead "for the small peasants". Soviet power there has already become a form of government.

Soviet government is a world-wide government. It is replacing the old bourgeois state. A republic as well as a monarchy is a form of the bourgeoisie's robbery of the people

if the capitalists are left with their property—the factories, banks and print-shops. The Bolsheviks were right when they said the world revolution was growing. It develops differently in different countries. It takes a long time and is not very easy. Any socialist who thinks the capitalists are going to renounce their rights at once is a bad socialist. No, the world has not seen such kindly capitalists yet. Socialism can only develop through struggle with capitalism. There has not yet been any ruling class which has given way without a fight. The capitalists know what Bolshevism is. They used to say: "Russian stupidity and Russian backwardness are making some sort of hocus-pocus there, nothing will come of it. They're chasing ghosts over there in Russia." But today these very same capitalist gentlemen realise this revolution is a world conflagration and only the workers' government can triumph. We are now setting up Poor Peasants' Committees. And in Germany most peasants are either farm labourers or small farmers. The big farmers are in most cases the German brand of landowners.

Yesterday the Swiss Government expelled our representative from the country, and we know the reason why. We know the French and British imperialists are scared because our representative has every day sent us telegrams and accounts of rallies in London at which the British workers have declared: "Down with British forces in Russia!" He sent us news about France too. The imperialists have reportedly presented the Russian representatives with an ultimatum. The Soviet government's representatives have been kicked out of Sweden as well and they must return to Russia. But it is still too early for them to rejoice. It is a barren victory. This step won't get them anywhere. No matter how hard the "Allies" try to hide the truth, deceive their people and get rid of representatives of Soviet Russia, the people will learn the whole truth in the end.

We are calling on you to give everything you have to repulse the "Allies" and support the Red Army. When we did not have the Red Army, what happened was understandable. But now we see that the Red Army is growing strong and winning battles. Our army is up against the British forces. And our army has officers who only yesterday came

up from the working class, who only yesterday had completed their military training. From prisoners, we have a lot of evidence that when they read the Constitution of our Republic in English they say to themselves they have been deceived, that Soviet Russia is not what they thought, that the Soviet government is a workers' government. And we say: "Yes, comrades, we are not only fighting for Soviet Russia, we are fighting for the government of workers and working people generally, the world over." As long as we can contain imperialism, the German revolution will strengthen. Revolution will strengthen elsewhere too. That is why, no matter what names they call it in Europe, this world revolution has stood up to its full stature and world imperialism will go under. Our position may be difficult but we have the assurance that we are not alone in fighting for a just cause, we have allies in the workers of every country.

Comrades, after these remarks on our international position, I want to say a few words about other questions. I want to talk about the petty-bourgeois parties. They considered themselves socialists. But they are not. We know full well that the institutions in capitalist society like banks, savings banks, mutual aid societies are called "mutual help" institutions, but in actual fact they are nothing of the sort, this name is a screen for robbery. These parties, which made out they were for the people, at the time when the Russian working class was fighting off Krasnov (he was arrested by our troops and set free, unfortunately, through the magnanimity of the Petrograders), those Menshevik and Right S.R. gentlemen were siding with the bourgeoisie. These parties of the petty bourgeoisie never know where to go—to the capitalists or to the workers. They are made up of people who live in the hope that one day they will grow rich. They constantly see that around them most small holders live badly—these are all working people. So these petty-bourgeois parties, who are scattered throughout the world, have begun to waver. This isn't new. It has always been the same, and that is how it is with us too. They all forsook us when the Brest-Litovsk Treaty came along, the hardest time of our revolution, when we had no army and we were forced to conclude a peace treaty, saying to ourselves: we shall not drop our socialist work for one minute. It slipped their

mind that Russia was making her supreme sacrifice for the socialist revolution, and they deserted to the Constituent Assembly advocates. These turned up in Samara and Siberia as well. Now they are being driven away from there and shown the only choice is between the landowners' government and the Bolsheviks' government. There is no middle course. Either the government of the oppressed or of the oppressors. All the poor peasants can only follow us. And they will only come when they see we do not stand on ceremony with the old regime and are doing everything for the good of the people. That is the only government of Soviets that could have had the people's support throughout the year despite the terrible conditions and famine. The workers and peasants realise that no matter how badly the war goes, the workers' and peasants' government will do everything it can against the capitalist exploiters, so that the whole burden of the war falls on these gentlemen's shoulders and not on the workers. And there you are, the workers' and peasants' government has had the people's support for more than a year.

Today, with the beginning of the German revolution, the Mensheviks and S.R.s are starting to change round. The best of them strove for socialism. But they thought the Bolsheviks were chasing ghosts, hoping for a miracle. Now they are convinced that whatever the Bolsheviks expected was not daydreams but real life. They see that the world revolution has begun and is growing throughout the world. And the best people among the Mensheviks and S.R.s are beginning to repent for their mistakes and realise that the Soviet government is not only Russian but a world-wide government of workers, and that no Constituent Assembly will help matters.

Britain, France and America know that today, now that the world revolution has flared up, they have no external enemies. The enemy comes from inside every country. A new breakthrough has arrived, when the Mensheviks and Right S.R.s are starting to waver and the best of them follow the Bolsheviks and see that though they swear by the Constituent Assembly they cannot help being on the side of the Whites. All over the world the question now is: either Soviet power or the power of the plunderers who have had ten million

people murdered in the war, twenty million maimed, and are now continuing to plunder other countries.

There you have, comrades, the question which causes the petty-bourgeois democrats to waver. We know these parties always have wavered and always will. Most of the people get their convictions straight from their own experience and have no trust in books and words. We tell the middle peasant he is not our enemy and we have no cause to oppress him. And if a local Soviet somewhere or other hits the middle peasant hard and it hurts, that Soviet must be taken away because it does not know how to act properly. The middle, petty-bourgeois democrats will always waver. And if they swing our way, like a pendulum, we must give them support. We tell them that if they are going to spoil our work, we don't want them. But if they are prepared to help us, we shall accept them. There are different groups among the Mensheviks, there is the group of "activists" which includes all those who have said: "It's about time we stopped criticising only and helped by action." We have said we shall fight the Czechs and whoever helps them will be dealt with ruthlessly. But when there are people who have seen their mistake, we must accept them and treat them with leniency. The person who stands in the middle between the worker and the capitalist will always waver. He thought the Soviet government would not last long. But he thought wrong. European imperialism cannot bring down our government. Revolution is now spreading all over the world. And we invite those who wavered and now see and understand their error, to come over to us. We won't turn them away. We must above all see to it that all these people, no matter what they were before, whether they wavered or not, as long as they are sincere, come over to us. We are now strong enough not to be afraid of anyone. We can stomach them all. But they cannot stomach us. Just remember that these parties are bound to waver. Today the pendulum swings one way, tomorrow the other. We must remain the proletarian party of workers and oppressed. But we are now in charge of the whole of Russia and our only enemy is the person who lives by another's labour. The others are not our enemies. They are only waverers. But waverers are not yet enemies.

Now, one more question. Food. As you all know, the food situation, which had improved somewhat in the autumn, is again on the decline. People are starving once more and things will be worse by the spring. Our rail transport is now very much in a mess. On top of everything, it is overburdened with prisoners of war coming home. Two million men are on their way home from Germany. These two million are utterly worn out. They have starved terribly. They are not people, but shadows, skeletons of people. Our transport suffered more from the fighting at home. There are no steam engines, and no carriages. And the food situation is getting really bad. In view of the seriousness of the situation, the Council of People's Commissars said to itself: We now have an army and discipline established by Party cells which exist in each regiment. The majority of officers are now from the workers and not sons of the rich. If these officers now appreciate that the working class must find people to run the country, and Red officers too, then the socialist army will really be socialist with officer personnel renovated by the presence of Red officers. We know the breakthrough has now arrived. We have an army. It has a new discipline. The discipline is maintained by the Party cells, workers and commissars who went to the front in their hundreds of thousands explaining to the workers and peasants what the war was all about. That is why the breakthrough started in our army. That is why it has had such a great effect. The British papers are saying they are now running up against a serious foe in Russia.

We are very well aware of the poor apparatus we have for procuring and distributing food supplies. Certain groups of people have wormed their way in who are swindling and robbing. We know, too, that among the railway workers all those who are shouldering the whole burden of the work are on the side of the Soviet government. But up top they back the old regime, are either causing sabotage or not working with a will. Comrades, you know this war is revolutionary. Every force in the country must be summoned for this war. The whole country must be turned into a revolutionary camp. Everyone must help. By help we do not only mean that everyone should go to the front, but that the class of our state which is leading everyone to freedom, and which is the

Soviet government's support, should run the country because it alone has the right to do so. We appreciate the difficulties resulting from the working class having been kept away both from administration and education for so long. We appreciate the difficulties of the workers in learning everything at once. Nevertheless, in military matters, the most difficult and dangerous of all, it was the working class which effected the breakthrough. The politically-conscious working class must help us to make the same sort of breakthrough with food supplies and the railways. Every railwayman and every food worker should regard himself as a soldier performing his duty. He should remember that he is fighting a war on hunger. He must throw off his former bureaucratic habits. The other day we passed a decree on forming a workers' food inspection. We told ourselves that we need the workers' participation to bring about a breakthrough in the railway apparatus, to make a type of Red Army out of it. Call on your people. Rig up courses, teach them, make them commissars. Only they, if they give us their staff, can turn the army of old civil servants into some sort of Red Socialist Army responsible for provisions, an army led by workers and working not under the lash but of their own free will, just like the Red officers are fighting and dying at the front, in the knowledge that they die for a socialist republic.

Brief report published
in *Pravda* No. 275,
December 18, 1918

First published in full in
the fourth Russian edition
of Lenin's *Collected Works*

Published according to
the verbatim report

TELEGRAM TO THE SAMARA UKRAINIANS

Samara, Gubernia Military Commissar for Samara Ukrainians

Consider it necessary to inform you in reply to telegram sent by Samara Ukrainians that in view of influx of Ukrainian volunteers and abundance of conscripts in Ukraine itself still without arms, Workers' and Peasants' Government of Ukraine considers it unnecessary to call up Ukrainians in Russia and dispatch them to Ukraine. In name of Council of People's Commissars propose you stop sending Ukrainian units to Ukraine.

Lenin, Stalin

Written December 16 or 17, 1918

Published according to
the telegram

“DEMOCRACY” AND DICTATORSHIP

The few numbers of the Berlin *Red Banner* and the Vienna *Call (Weckruf)*,¹⁴⁷ organ of the Communist Party of German Austria, that have reached Moscow, show that the traitors to socialism—those who supported the war of the predatory imperialists—the Scheidemanns and Eberts, Austerlitzes and Renners—are getting the rebuff they deserve from the genuine representatives of the revolutionary workers of Germany and Austria. We extend warm greetings to both papers, which epitomise the vitality and growth of the Third International.

Apparently the chief question of the revolution both in Germany and Austria now is: Constituent Assembly or Soviet government? The spokesmen of the bankrupt Second International, all the way from Scheidemann to Kautsky, stand for the first and describe their stand as defence of “democracy” (Kautsky has even gone so far as to call it “pure democracy”) as distinct from dictatorship. In the pamphlet *The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky*, which has just come off the press in Moscow and Petrograd, I examine Kautsky’s views in detail. I shall try briefly to give the substance of the point at issue, which has become the question of the day for all the advanced capitalist countries.

The Scheidemanns and Kautskys speak about “pure democracy” and “democracy” in general for the purpose of deceiving the people and concealing from them the *bourgeois* character of *present-day* democracy. Let the bourgeoisie continue to keep the entire apparatus of state power in their hands, let a handful of exploiters continue to use the former, bourgeois, state machine! Elections held in such circumstances are lauded by the bourgeoisie, for very good reasons, as being “free”, “equal”, “democratic” and “universal”.

These words are designed to conceal the truth, to conceal the fact that the means of production and political power remain in the hands of the exploiters, and that therefore real freedom and real equality for the exploited, that is, for the vast majority of the population, are out of the question. It is profitable and indispensable for the bourgeoisie to conceal from the people the *bourgeois* character of modern democracy, to picture it as democracy in general or "pure democracy", and the Scheidemanns and the Kautskys, repeating this, *in practice* abandon the standpoint of the proletariat and side with the bourgeoisie. .

Marx and Engels in their last joint preface to the *Communist Manifesto* (in 1872) considered it necessary specially to warn the workers that the proletariat cannot simply lay hold of the ready-made (that is, the bourgeois) state machine and wield it for its own purpose, that it must smash it, break it up. The renegade Kautsky, who has written a special pamphlet entitled *The Dictatorship of the Proletariat*, concealed from the workers this most important Marxist truth, utterly distorted Marxism, and, quite obviously, the praise which Scheidemann and Co. showered on the pamphlet was fully merited as praise by agents of the bourgeoisie for one switching to the side of the bourgeoisie.

It is sheer mockery of the working and exploited people to speak of pure democracy, of democracy in general, of equality, freedom and universal rights when the workers and all working people are ill-fed, ill-clad, ruined and worn out not only as a result of capitalist wage-slavery, but as a consequence of four years of predatory war, while the capitalists and profiteers remain in possession of the "property" usurped by them and the "ready-made" apparatus of state power. This is tantamount to trampling on the basic truths of Marxism which has taught the workers: you must take advantage of bourgeois democracy which, compared with feudalism, represents a great historical advance, but not for one minute must you forget the bourgeois character of this "democracy", its historically conditional and limited character. Never share the "superstitious belief" in the "state" and never forget that the state even in the most democratic republic, and not only in a monarchy, is simply a machine for the suppression of one class by another.

The bourgeoisie are compelled to be hypocritical and to describe as "popular government" or democracy in general, or pure democracy, the (*bourgeois*) democratic republic which is, in practice, the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, the dictatorship of the exploiters over the working people. The Scheidemanns and Kautskys, the Austerlitzes and Renners (and now, to our regret, with the help of Friedrich Adler) fall in line with this falsehood and hypocrisy. But Marxists, Communists, expose this hypocrisy, and tell the workers and the working people in general this frank and straightforward truth: the democratic republic, the Constituent Assembly, general elections, etc., are, in practice, the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, and for the emancipation of labour from the yoke of capital there is no other way but to replace this dictatorship with the *dictatorship of the proletariat*.

The dictatorship of the proletariat alone can emancipate humanity from the oppression of capital, from the lies, falsehood and hypocrisy of bourgeois democracy—democracy *for the rich*—and establish democracy *for the poor*, that is, make the blessings of democracy *really* accessible to the workers and poor peasants, whereas now (even in the most democratic—*bourgeois*—republic) the blessings of democracy are, *in fact*, inaccessible to the vast majority of working people.

Take, for example, freedom of assembly and freedom of the press. The Scheidemanns and Kautskys, the Austerlitzes and Renners assure the workers that the present elections to the Constituent Assembly in Germany and Austria are "democratic". That is a lie. *In practice* the capitalists, the exploiters, the landowners and the profiteers own 9/10 of the best meeting halls, and 9/10 of the stocks of newsprint, printing-presses, etc. The urban workers and the farm hands and day labourers are, *in practice*, debarred from democracy by the "sacred right of property" (guarded by the Kautskys and Renners, and now, to our regret, by Friedrich Adler as well) and by the bourgeois state apparatus, that is, bourgeois officials, bourgeois judges, and so on. The present "freedom of assembly and the press" in the "democratic" (*bourgeois-democratic*) German republic is false and hypocritical, because *in fact* it is *freedom for the rich to buy and*

bribe the press, *freedom for the rich* to befuddle the people with the venomous lies of the bourgeois press, *freedom for the rich* to keep as their "property" the landowners' mansions, the best buildings, etc. The dictatorship of the proletariat *will take* from the capitalists and hand over to the working people the landowners' mansions, the best buildings, printing-presses and the stocks of newsprint.

But this means replacing "universal", "pure" democracy by the "dictatorship of one class", scream the Scheidemanns and Kautskys, the Austerlitzes and Renners (together with their followers in other countries—the Gomperses, Hendersons, Renaudels, Vandervelde and Co.).

Wrong, we reply. This means replacing what in fact is the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie (a dictatorship hypocritically cloaked in the forms of the democratic bourgeois republic) by the dictatorship of the proletariat. This means replacing democracy for the rich by democracy for the poor. This means replacing freedom of assembly and the press for the minority, for the exploiters, by freedom of assembly and the press for the *majority* of the population, for the working people. This means a gigantic, world-historic *extension* of democracy, its transformation from falsehood into truth, the liberation of humanity from the shackles of capital, which *distorts* and truncates any, even the most "democratic" and republican, *bourgeois* democracy. This means replacing the bourgeois state by the *proletarian* state, a replacement that is the sole way the state can eventually wither away altogether.

But why not reach this goal without the dictatorship of one class? Why not switch directly to "pure" democracy? So ask the hypocritical friends of the bourgeoisie or the naïve petty bourgeois and philistines gulled by them.

And we reply: Because in any capitalist society the decisive say lies with either the bourgeoisie or the proletariat, while the small proprietors, inevitably, remain wavering, helpless, stupid dreamers of "pure", i.e., non-class or above-class, democracy. Because from a society in which one class oppresses another there is no way out other than through the dictatorship of the oppressed class. Because the proletariat alone is capable of defeating the bourgeoisie, of overthrowing them, being the sole class which capitalism

has united and "schooled", and which is capable of drawing to its side the wavering mass of the working population with a petty-bourgeois way of life, of drawing them to its side or at least "neutralising" them. Because only mealy-mouthed petty bourgeois and philistines can dream—deceiving thereby both themselves and the workers—of overthrowing capitalist oppression without a long and difficult process of *suppressing the resistance* of the exploiters. In Germany and Austria this resistance is not yet very pronounced because expropriation of the expropriators has not yet begun. But once expropriation begins the resistance will be fierce and desperate. In concealing this from themselves and from the workers the Scheidemanns and Kautskys, the Austerlitzes and Renners betray the interests of the proletariat, switching at the most decisive moment from the class struggle and overthrow of the yoke of the bourgeoisie to getting the proletariat to come to terms with the bourgeoisie, achieving "social peace" or reconciliation of exploited and exploiters.

Rеволюции are the locomotives of history, said Marx.¹⁴⁸ Revolutions teach quickly. The urban workers and farm hands in Germany and Austria will quickly discern the betrayal of the cause of socialism by the Scheidemanns and Kautskys, the Austerlitzes and Renners. The proletariat will cast aside these "social traitors"—socialists in words and betrayers of socialism in practice—as it did in Russia with the same kind of petty bourgeoisie and philistines—the Mensheviks and "Socialist-Revolutionaries". The more complete the domination of the above-mentioned "leaders", the quicker the proletariat will see that only the replacement of the bourgeois state, be it the most democratic bourgeois republic, by a state of the type of the Paris Commune (about which so much was said by Marx, who has been distorted and betrayed by the Scheidemanns and Kautskys) or by a state of the Soviet type, can open the way to socialism. The dictatorship of the proletariat will deliver humanity from capitalist oppression and war.

Moscow, December 23, 1918

HEROISM OF THE PRESNYA WORKERS

Thirteen years ago the workers of Moscow raised the standard of revolt against tsarism. This was the culminating point in the development of the first workers' revolution against tsarism. The workers were defeated, and Presnya ran with workers' blood.

The unforgettable heroism of the Moscow workers set an example of militancy to the working people throughout Russia. But these people were then too ignorant, too disunited, and failed to back the heroes of Presnya and Moscow as a whole who rose in arms against the tsarist, landlord monarchy.

The defeat of the Moscow workers was followed by the defeat of the first revolution as a whole. For twelve long and painful years the savage landlord reaction tortured all the workers and peasants of all nationalities of Russia.

The heroism of the Presnya workers was not in vain. Their sacrifices bore fruit. The first breach was made in the tsarist monarchy; the breach was slowly but surely widened, weakening the obsolete, medieval regime. The heroism of the Moscow workers started a deep ferment among the urban and rural working people, the effects of which never died down, in spite of all persecution.

Before the armed insurrection of December 1905, the people of Russia were incapable of waging a mass armed struggle against their exploiters. After December they were no longer the same people. They had been reborn. They had received their baptism of fire. They had been steeled in revolt. They trained the fighters who were victorious in 1917 and who now, despite the incredible difficulties, and

overcoming the torments of hunger and devastation caused by the imperialist war, are fighting for the world victory of socialism.

Long live the workers of Red Presnya, the vanguard of the world workers' revolution!

Byednota No. 222,
December 24, 1918
Signed: *N. Lenin*

Published according to
the *Byednota* text

SPEECH TO THE SECOND ALL-RUSSIA
CONGRESS OF ECONOMIC COUNCILS¹⁴⁹
DECEMBER 25, 1918

(Ovation.) Comrades, first I want to say a few words about the Soviet Republic's international situation. Of course, you all know that the main issue at stake is the victory of the British, French and American imperialists and their attempts to seize complete possession of the whole world, and, particularly, to destroy Soviet Russia.

At the beginning of the October Revolution, as you know, not only the majority of the West-European bourgeoisie, but also a certain section of the Russian bourgeoisie believed that what was going on in our country was a sort of socialist experiment which could have no essential and serious significance from a world point of view. Particularly arrogant and short-sighted bourgeois people frequently maintained that the communist experiments in Russia could serve no other purpose than to give satisfaction to German imperialism. And, unfortunately, there were people who allowed themselves to be blinded by such words and who, incidentally, regarded the fantastically harsh and coercive terms of the Brest-Litovsk Peace Treaty from this angle. In actual fact, these people were wittingly or unwittingly fostering petty-bourgeois class patriotism and regarding the growing unfavourable situation not from the point of view of its world significance, nor from the development of events on a world scale, but from the point of view that German imperialism is the chief enemy, and that these harsh and immensely extortionate peace terms were a triumph for the German imperialists.

Indeed, if we regard the events of that period from the point of view of the situation in Russia, more ruinous terms can scarcely be imagined. But the folly of the calculations of the German imperialists became apparent within a few months, when the Germans were conquering the Ukraine and bragging to the German bourgeoisie, and even more so to the German proletariat, that the moment had arrived to reap the fruits of imperialist policy, and that in the Ukraine they would get everything Germany needed. That was a very short-sighted and shallow judgement of events.

For it soon became apparent that the only people who were right were those who regarded events from the point of view of their influence on the development of the world revolution. The example of the Ukraine, which had suffered tremendously, in fact showed that the only correct judgement of events was one based on a study and careful observation of the international proletarian revolution. Imperialism found itself hard pressed by the working people, whose condition had become intolerable. And we can now see that the Ukrainian episode was one of the links in the process of growth of the world revolution.

The German imperialists were able to procure from the Ukraine far less material benefits than they had anticipated. On the other hand, this transformation of the war into a patently predatory one demoralised the entire German army, while contact with Soviet Russia started in this army of German working people the process of disintegration which was to make itself felt a few months later. And now that the British and American imperialists have become even more arrogant, and regard themselves as overlords whom nobody can resist, we have no illusions about the extremely difficult situation in which we find ourselves. The Entente powers have now overstepped the bounds of the possible for bourgeois policy; they have overdone it, just as the German imperialists overdid it in February and March 1918 in concluding the Brest-Litovsk Peace Treaty. The cause that led to the collapse of German imperialism is again clearly perceptible in the case of Anglo-French imperialism. The latter has imposed peace terms on Germany that are far worse, far harsher than those which Germany imposed on us when concluding the Brest-Litovsk Peace Treaty.

In doing so, Anglo-French imperialism has overstepped the bounds and this will later prove fatal. Beyond these bounds imperialism forfeits the hope of holding down the working people.

In spite of the hullabaloo raised by the chauvinists around Germany's defeat and destruction, in spite of the fact that the war is not yet officially over, we can already discern signs in France and Britain of an extremely rapid growth of the labour movement and a change of attitude by politicians who were formerly chauvinists but who are now opposing their governments' attempt to meddle in Russian affairs. If we add to this the recent newspaper reports about the beginnings of fraternisation on the part of the British and American soldiers, and if we remember that imperialist armies consist of citizens who are being held in check by deceit and threats, we can see that Soviet Russia is standing on fairly firm ground. With this general picture of world war and revolution before us, we are absolutely calm, and regard the future with complete confidence. And we assert that Anglo-French imperialism has gone so far as to overstep all the bounds of peace practically obtainable by imperialists and to fall in danger of complete collapse.

The tasks that the Entente powers, who are continuing the imperialist war, have set themselves are to stifle revolution and to seize and divide up all countries of the world. But although Britain and America have been more exempt from the horrors of war than Germany, and although their democratically organised bourgeoisie are much more far-sighted than the German, the British and American imperialists have lost their heads and are now compelled by objective conditions to undertake a task that is beyond their power. They are being forced to maintain troops for purposes of pacification and suppression.

Nevertheless, our present situation demands a maximum exertion of effort. And we must still set greater value on a month than we formerly did on a whole decade, because we are now doing a hundred times more. Besides safeguarding the Russian Republic, we are doing a great job for the world proletariat. Intense effort is demanded of us, immense work in compiling a plan of organisation and in defining general relations.

Passing to the question of our immediate tasks, I must say that the main thing has already been accomplished, and that in the interval between the First and Second Congresses of the Economic Councils the principal type of work has been outlined. A general plan of running industry, nationalised undertakings and whole branches of industry has been drawn up and put on a firm basis with the help of the trade unions. Incidentally, we shall continue to combat all syndicalist, separatist, parochial and regional tendencies, which can only harm our cause.

The military situation imposes a special responsibility and grave duties on us. Collegiate management with the participation of the trade unions is essential. Collegiate bodies are necessary, but collegiate management must not be allowed to become a hindrance to practical work. And when I personally now see the way economic tasks are being carried out by our undertakings, what strikes me most is that the executive part of our work, associated as it is with collective discussion, at times impedes the execution. This transition from collective execution to personal responsibility is the urgent problem of the day.

We shall unreservedly demand that all the Economic Councils, Central Boards and Central Administrations see that the collegiate system of management is not reduced to empty discussion, to writing resolutions, to compiling plans and to regional favouritism. That would be intolerable. We shall firmly insist that every member of an Economic Council and every member of a Central Board shall know for which branch of economy, in the narrow sense, he is responsible. When we receive reports that raw material is available, but people do not know how much, cannot work it out, when we hear complaints that warehouses filled with goods are under lock and key while the peasants are demanding, and justly demanding, commodity exchange, and are refusing to surrender grain in exchange for devaluated paper notes, we must know what member of what particular collegiate board is guilty of red tape. We must say that this member is responsible for the red tape and will be made to answer for it from the defence point of view, i.e., he will be liable to immediate arrest and court martial, even if he is a member of the most important union in the most

important Central Board. He must be made to answer for the practical performance of the most simple and elementary things, such as keeping account of goods in the warehouses and putting them to proper use. It is in the performance of such elementary duties that obstructions most frequently arise.

From the historical standpoint, this should not evoke any misgivings, because in breaking new ground a certain amount of time has to be spent in outlining the general plan, which is then developed in the actual process of work. On the contrary, it is astonishing how much has been done in this respect in so short a time. From the military and the socialist standpoint, however, when the proletariat demands all-out efforts from us so that there may be bread and warm coats, so that they are not so short of footwear, foodstuffs, and so on, commodity exchange must be increased to three times and ten times as much as at present. This side of the matter must be made the immediate task of the Economic Councils.

What we require is practical work by people who will be responsible for exchanging grain for goods, for seeing that grain is not lying about, for proper account of the raw materials in every warehouse, as well as for seeing that they do not lie about unutilised, and for real assistance being given in production.

The co-operatives, too, must be approached in a business-like way. When I hear members of the Economic Councils asserting that the co-operative societies are a matter for shopkeepers, that they are full of Mensheviks and whiteguards, and that we must therefore keep them at arm's length, I maintain that these people display complete ignorance of the matter. They absolutely fail to understand the tasks of the moment when, instead of referring to the good co-operators as experts, they refer to them as people who are stretching out a hand to the whiteguards. They should mind their own business: we have the Extraordinary Commissions for ferreting out whiteguards, and that business should be left to them. The co-operatives, after all, are the only apparatus created by capitalist society which we must utilise. And we shall therefore ruthlessly punish by military law any attempt to replace action by arguments

that are the epitome of short-sightedness, gross stupidity and intellectual conceit. (*Stormy applause.*)

When to this day, after the lapse of a year, matters are not organised as they should be, when, confronted by practical problems, we still continue to discuss plans while the country is demanding bread, felt boots and the distribution of raw materials on time, such red tape and meddling in other people's affairs are not to be tolerated.

There are sometimes people in our apparatus who incline towards the whiteguards, but given communist control in all our institutions these people cannot acquire political significance or leading positions. There cannot be the slightest doubt on this score. But we need them as practical workers, and there is no need to fear them. I have no doubt that Communists are splendid people, that there are splendid organisers among them, but it will take years and years to obtain such organisers in large numbers, and we cannot wait.

Now we can obtain these workers from among the bourgeoisie, from among the experts and intellectuals. And we shall ask all comrades working in the Economic Councils: what, sirs, have you done to enlist experienced people in the work? What have you done to secure experts, salesmen, efficient bourgeois co-operators, who must work for you in no worse a manner than they did for the Kolupayevs and Razuvayevs?¹⁶⁰ Time to abandon the old prejudices and enlist all the experts we need in our work. Every collegiate body, every Communist executive must know this. The pledge of success lies in this attitude.

Let's cut out the idle talk and get down to practical work to extricate our country from the ring in which the imperialists have surrounded it. That must be the position of every Soviet and co-operative organisation. We need action and more action! The proletariat will forfeit much if, once in power, it cannot utilise that power, put the problem practically and solve it practically. It is about time you dropped the idea that only Communists, among whom there are unquestionably excellent people, can perform a particular job. It is about time you lost this prejudice; we need many workers who know their job, and we must enlist them all in the work.

Capitalism has left us a valuable legacy in the shape of its biggest experts. And we must be sure to utilise them, and utilise them on a broad and mass scale; we must put every one of them to work. We have no time to spend on training experts from among our Communists, because everything now depends on practical work and practical results.

We must demand that every member of a collegiate body, every member of a responsible institution take charge of a job and be fully responsible for it. It is absolutely essential that everyone who takes charge of a definite branch of work should be responsible for everything, both for production and distribution. I must tell you that our Soviet Republic's situation is such that given proper distribution of bread and other goods we can hold on for a very, very long time. But we must have a proper policy of definitely abandoning all red tape. We must act swiftly and decisively, we must appoint definite people for definite responsible work, every one of them must know his job exactly, must answer for it exactly, answer for it even with his head. That is the policy we are pursuing in the Council of People's Commissars and in the Council of Defence¹⁶¹; and to this policy all the activities of the Economic Councils and the co-operatives must be subordinated. That is the path the proletariat's policy must take.

We must see to it that the wheels of commodity exchange revolve properly. That is the whole problem right now. An enormous amount of work has to be done in this sphere, and, in conclusion, my emphatic appeal to all of you is to do your share of this work. (*Prolonged applause.*)

Brief reports published
in *Izvestia* No. 284 and
Ekonomicheskaya Zhizn No. 42,
December 26, 1918

Published according
to the book

TASKS OF THE TRADE UNIONS

I

The theses by Tomsky, Radus-Zenkovich and Nogin each express the viewpoint of the particular job they represent: trade unions, commissariat and co-operatives with mutual benefit societies.

Each group of theses therefore suffers from a lopsided emphasis of only one side of the picture and an overshadowing and suppression of the fundamental points at issue.

A correct picture of these fundamental issues concerning the trade union movement today and its attitude towards the Soviet government requires above all proper consideration for the specific features of the *present, given* situation in the transition from capitalism to socialism.

All three gave insufficient attention or virtually no attention at all to this vital aspect of the matter.

II

The chief feature of the present situation in this respect is as follows.

The Soviet government as the dictatorship of the proletariat is victorious both among the urban proletariat and among the poor peasants but has far from won over by communist propaganda and strong organisation all trades and the whole mass of semi-proletarians.

Hence the special importance, particularly at the moment, of stepping up our propaganda and organisational work so that, on the one hand, we extend our influence over those workers and employees who are the *least Soviet* (that is,

the furthest from fully accepting Soviet policy), and subordinate them to the general proletarian movement. And so that, on the other hand, we shake up and rouse ideologically, and rally organisationally, the most backward sections and individuals among the proletariat and semi-proletariat, such as the unskilled workers, the town servants, rural semi-proletariat, and so on.

Then, the second principal feature of the present situation is that the construction of socialist society is based on a solid foundation, that is, we have not only done more than map it out and set it as our immediate practical goal; we have formed several highly important bodies of this construction (the Economic Councils, for example), had certain experience of their relationship with mass organisations (trade unions, co-operatives), and obtained certain practical results. All the same, however, our construction is not yet finished by any means, we still have very many flaws to iron out, the very essentials are not yet guaranteed (for instance, proper collection and distribution of grain, production and distribution of fuel), and the main body of working people are still not playing a big enough part in the construction.

III

With this in view, the trade unions have the following tasks at present.

There can be no talk of any sort of trade union "neutrality". Any campaign for neutrality is either a hypocritical screen for counter-revolution or a complete lack of class-consciousness.

We are now strong enough in the basic core of the trade union movement to be able to bring under our influence and proletarian discipline both the backward and the passive non-Communists inside the unions, and those workers who are still in some respects petty-bourgeois.

So the chief aim now is, not to break the resistance of a strong enemy, for Soviet Russia no longer has such an enemy among the proletarians and semi-proletarians, but to overcome by stubborn, persistent, more extensive educational and organisational work the prejudices of certain petty-bourgeois sections of the proletariat and semi-proletariat.

The unions must steadily extend the insufficiently wide base of the Soviet government (that is, increase the number of workers and poor peasants directly taking part in state administration), educate the backward working people (by practical experience in management as well as by books, lectures and newspapers), and discover *new organisational forms* both for these new tasks of the trade union movement in general, and for attracting a far more numerous mass of semi-proletarians, like the poor peasants, for example.

Thus, they must attract *all* trade union members into state administration—through the system of commissars, through participation in lightning control groups, and so on and so forth. They must attract the housemaid, first into co-operative work, in supplying the population with provisions, supervising their production, etc., and then into more responsible and less “narrow” work—but of course with the necessary gradualness.

They must get the specialists into state work together with the workers and keep an eye on them.

Transitional forms demand new bounds of organisation. Thus, for instance, the Poor Peasants' Committees are playing a tremendous role. There may be a danger that their merging with the Soviets would somewhere end up by leaving the *mass* of semi-proletarians *outside* of the bounds of permanent organisation. But we cannot forgo the task of organising the poor peasants under the pretext that they are not hired hands. It is possible and even necessary to search, search and search again for new forms, if only, for example, by forming unions of poor peasants (perhaps the very same Poor Peasants' Committees) as unions of *the very poor* (a) uninterested in grain profiteering and high grain prices, (b) interested in improving their lot by common measures for everyone, (c) interested in strengthening socialised farming, (d) interested in a permanent alliance with the urban workers, etc.

Such a poor peasant union could make up a *special section* of the All-Russia Trade Union Council to prevent it overwhelming the completely proletarian elements. The form can be modified and must be sought through applying it to practice, to the new task of embracing the new, transitional social types (the village poor are not the proletariat, and

now not even semi-proletariat, but *those who* stand closest to the semi-proletariat since capitalism is not yet dead, and at the same time *those who* are most sympathetic to the transition to socialism)....*

Published according to
the manuscript

* Here the manuscript ends.—*Ed.*

A LITTLE PICTURE IN ILLUSTRATION OF BIG PROBLEMS

Comrade Sosnovsky, editor of *Byednota*,¹⁶² has brought me a remarkable book. As many workers and peasants as possible should be made familiar with it. Most valuable lessons, splendidly illustrated by vivid examples, are to be drawn from it on some of the major problems of socialist construction. The book, by Comrade Alexander Todorsky, is called *A Year with Rifle and Plough* and was published in the little town of Vesyegonsk by the local uyezd Executive Committee to mark the anniversary of the October Revolution.

The author describes the year's experience of the men in charge of organising Soviet power in the Vesyegonsk Uyezd—first the Civil War, the revolt of the local kulaks and its suppression, and then “peaceful creative life”. The author has succeeded in giving such a simple, and at the same time such a lively, account of the course of the revolution in this rural backwater, that to attempt to retell it could only weaken its effect. This book should be distributed as widely as possible, and it would be very good if many more of those who have been working among the people and with the people, in the very thick of life, sat down to describe their experiences. The publication of several hundred, or even several dozen, such descriptions, the best, most truthfully and plainly told and containing numerous valuable facts, would be infinitely more useful to the cause of socialism than many of the newspaper and magazine articles and books by professional journalists and writers who only too often cannot see real life for the paper they write on.

Let me give a brief example from Comrade Todorsky's narrative. It was suggested that "merchant hands" should not be allowed to go "unemployed", but should be encouraged to "set to work".

"...With this end in view, three young, energetic and very business-like manufacturers, E. Yefremov, A. Loginov and N. Kozlov, were summoned to the Executive Committee and ordered on pain of imprisonment and confiscation of all property to set up a sawmill and tannery. The work was started immediately.

The Soviet authorities were not mistaken in their choice of men, and the manufacturers, to their credit, were among the first to realise that they were not dealing with 'casual and temporary guests', but with real masters who had taken power firmly into their hands.

"Having quite rightly realised this, they set to work energetically to carry out the orders of the Executive Committee, with the result that Vesyegonsk now has a sawmill going at full swing, covering the needs of the local population and filling orders for a new railway under construction.

"As to the tannery, the premises are now ready, and the engine, drums and other machinery, obtained from Moscow, are being installed, so that in a month and a half, or two at the most, Vesyegonsk will be getting fine leather of its own make.

"The building of two Soviet plants by 'non-Soviet' hands is a good example of how to fight a class which is hostile to us.

"To rap the exploiters over the knuckles, to render them harmless or 'finish them off', is only half the job. The whole job will be done only when we compel them to work, and with the fruits of their labour help to improve the new life and strengthen Soviet power."

These fine and absolutely true words should be carved in stone and prominently displayed in every Economic Council, food organisation, factory, land department and so on. For what has been understood by our comrades in remote Vesyegonsk is all too often stubbornly ignored by Soviet officials in the capitals. It is quite common to meet a Soviet intellectual or worker, a Communist, who turns his nose up at the mere mention of co-operative societies and declares with an air of profound importance—and with equally profound stupidity—that these are not Soviet hands, they are bourgeois people, shopkeepers, Mensheviks, that at such and such a time and place the co-operators used their financial manipulations to conceal aid given to white-guards, and that in our Socialist Republic the supply and distribution apparatus must be built up by clean Soviet hands.

Such arguments are typical insofar as the truth is so mixed with falsehood that we consequently get a most dangerous distortion of the aims of communism that can do incalculable harm to our cause.

The co-operatives certainly are an apparatus of bourgeois society, an apparatus which grew up in an atmosphere of "shopkeeping" and which has trained its leaders in the spirit of bourgeois politics and in a bourgeois outlook, and has therefore been producing a large proportion of whiteguards or their accomplices. That is undeniable. But it is a bad thing when absurd conclusions are drawn from undeniable truths, by their oversimplification and slapdash application. We can only build communism out of the material created by capitalism, out of that refined apparatus which has been moulded under bourgeois conditions and which—as far as concerns the human material in the apparatus—is therefore inevitably imbued with the bourgeois mentality. That is what makes the building of communist society difficult, but it is also a guarantee that it can and will be built. In fact, what distinguishes Marxism from the old, utopian socialism is that the latter wanted to build the new society not from the mass human material produced by bloodstained, sordid, rapacious, shopkeeping capitalism, but from very virtuous men and women reared in special hothouses and cucumber frames. Everyone now sees that this absurd idea really is absurd and everyone has discarded it, but not everyone is willing or able to give thought to the opposite doctrine of Marxism and to think out how communism can (and should) be built from the mass human material which has been corrupted by hundreds and thousands of years of slavery, serfdom, capitalism, by small individual enterprise, and by the war of every man against his neighbour to obtain a place in the market, or a higher price for his product or his labour.

The co-operatives are a bourgeois apparatus. Hence they do not deserve to be trusted *politically*; but this does not mean we may turn our backs on the task of using them for administration and construction. Political distrust means we must not put non-Soviet people in *politically* responsible posts. It means the Cheka must keep a sharp eye on members of classes, sections or groups that have leanings towards the

whiteguards. (Though, incidentally, one need not go to the same absurd lengths as Comrade Latsis, one of our finest, tried and tested Communists, did in his Kazan magazine, *Krasny Terror*. He wanted to say that Red terror meant the forcible suppression of exploiters who attempted to restore their rule, but instead, he put it this way [on page 2 of the first issue of his magazine]: "Don't search [!!?] the records for evidence of whether his revolt against the Soviet was an armed or only a verbal one.")

Political distrust of the members of a bourgeois apparatus is legitimate and essential. But to refuse to use them in administration and construction would be the height of folly, fraught with untold harm to communism. If anybody tried to recommend a Menshevik as a socialist, or as a political leader, or even as a political adviser, he would be committing a great mistake, for the history of the revolution in Russia has definitely shown that the Mensheviks (and the Socialist-Revolutionaries) are not socialists, but petty-bourgeois democrats who are capable of siding with the *bourgeoisie* every time the class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie becomes particularly acute. But petty-bourgeois democracy is not a chance political formation, not an exception, but a *necessary* product of capitalism. And it is not only the old, pre-capitalist, economically reactionary middle peasants who are the "purveyors" of this democracy. So, too, are the co-operative societies with their capitalist training that have sprung from the soil of large-scale capitalism, the intellectuals, etc. After all, even backward Russia produced, side by side with the Kolupayevs and Razuvayevs, capitalists who knew how to make use of the services of educated intellectuals, be they Menshevik, Socialist-Revolutionary or non-party. Are we to be more stupid than those capitalists and fail to use such "building material" in erecting a communist Russia?

Written at the end of 1918
or beginning of 1919

Published according to
the manuscript

TELEGRAM TO STALIN AND DZERZHINSKY¹⁵

14.1.19

Glazov, for Stalin and Dzerzhinsky

Received and read first code message. Request both of you personally to see to execution of intended measures on spot, otherwise no guarantee of success.

Lenin

Published according to
the manuscript

**SPEECH AT A JOINT SESSION OF THE ALL-RUSSIA
CENTRAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE,
THE MOSCOW SOVIET
AND ALL-RUSSIA TRADE UNION CONGRESS
JANUARY 17, 1919¹⁴⁴**

(Stormy ovation.) Comrades, allow me to begin by briefly mentioning the chief facts relating to our food policy. I think these brief remarks will be useful in enabling us to form a correct judgement of the significance of the resolution we are recommending today for adoption by the All-Russia Central Executive Committee. They should also enable us to form an opinion of our whole food policy in general, and of the role which now, when a difficult change is coming, falls to the organised proletariat—that vanguard and chief buttress of Soviet Russia and the socialist revolution.

Our food policy has been marked by three major acts, which, taken chronologically, are as follows: first—the decision to form Poor Peasants' Committees, a step which lies at the very basis of our food policy and which, moreover, was a tremendously important turning-point in the whole course of development and structure of our revolution. By taking this step we crossed the boundary dividing the bourgeois from the socialist revolution. By themselves, the victory of the working class in the cities and the transfer of all factories to the proletarian state would not have been enough to create and consolidate the foundation of a socialist system, if we had not also created for ourselves not a general peasant, but a really proletarian buttress in the countryside. In October, we had to confine ourselves to uniting the proletariat and the peasants in general, as a

whole. And thanks to this alliance we were able rapidly to destroy the landlord system and sweep it off the face of the earth. But it was only when we proceeded to organise the poor peasants, the peasant proletariat and semi-proletariat, that a durable alliance could be formed between the mass of the urban proletariat and rural proletariat. Only then could the war against the kulaks and the peasant bourgeoisie be fought in real earnest. This radical step continues to be the keystone of our food policy.

The second step, less important perhaps, was the decree passed with the participation and on the initiative of our representatives, the decree on utilising the co-operative societies. There we resolved that we must make use of the machinery created by the co-operatives and capitalist society in general, and which, for obvious reasons, was weaker in Russia than in Western Europe. In this respect we were guilty of many sins and many omissions in the towns and big proletarian centres, as well as in the countryside. Here we are up against a lack of understanding and ability, prejudices and traditions which tend to repel us from the co-operatives. It is quite natural that there should be many non-proletarians in the upper ranks of the co-operative movement. We must fight these people, who are capable of swinging over to the bourgeoisie, and the counter-revolutionary elements and their scheming. But at the same time we must preserve this machinery, the co-operative machinery—which is likewise a capitalist heritage—this machinery of distribution among millions of people, without which we cannot build socialism with any success. In this respect the Food Commissariat has outlined a correct policy, but we have not yet put it fully into effect. The proposals we are submitting today to the All-Russia Central Executive Committee on behalf of the Communist group, which insists that the co-operative machinery be utilised, are one more step in the same direction. We must know how to combat the undesirable top officials in the co-operative machinery—we have forces and authority enough for that, for it would be silly to think they can put up any serious resistance. We must know how to combat them, but we must utilise the co-operative machinery without fail so as not to squander our forces, so that this machine may be united,

and so that the Communists may devote their energies not only to political, but also to organisational work, and make technical use of the machinery which stands ready for this work—the co-operative machinery.

The third step in our food policy is the formation of workers' food organisations. Here, a responsible task confronts you, the food workers. Our path is the right path for us to follow, and we must see to it that it is followed by all the Commissariats. It is a measure of general social and class importance as well as of importance for food supplies. To make the socialist revolution lasting, a new class must run the country. We know that prior to 1861¹⁵⁵ it was the feudal landowners who were the power that governed Russia. We know that since then, generally speaking, the power that governed was the bourgeoisie, those from the wealthy. The permanence of the socialist revolution will depend on the extent we can elevate the new class, the proletariat, to the work of government, have Russia governed by the proletariat. We must make this work of government a step towards the universal training of the working people in the art of governing the state, a training not derived from books or newspapers, speeches or pamphlets, but from practice, enabling everyone to try his hand at this work.

That, comrades, is the chief stage in our food policy, which at the same time is indicative of the very character of its structure. Very responsible duties here confront our food supply comrades. It need scarcely be said that there is no more cruel and dreadful calamity than famine, that the people are naturally driven to impatience, anger and indignation by every flop in this sphere, for it is a calamity that cannot be endured. Nor need it be said that the Food Commissariat's task is a most difficult one. You know, and the comrades from the trade unions know it particularly, how much chaos and disorder there is in running the big factories, in keeping stock of their output. Yet this is a thousand times easier than keeping stock of food which is gathered in by millions of peasants. But we have no alternative. There is a general food shortage in the country. There is not enough to go round.

What do we mean when we say that certain foodstuffs are scarce? It means we could avoid starvation, although living

on reduced rations, if we were now to distribute them among the whole population, if every peasant were to turn over all his produce, if everybody were to cut consumption somewhat below the standard of sufficiency—because there is not enough for a full standard all round—if every peasant were to agree to reduce his consumption somewhat below the standard of sufficiency and turn over all the rest to the state, and if we distributed it all properly. But, if we set ourselves this aim, it is obviously impossible to carry it out by ordinary means amidst the present state of economic disruption and with our nation-wide inefficiency—we are only just getting the knack; we had nowhere to get it from before. If there is a shortage of food, it means ... what does it mean? It means that if you were to sanction free trade when there is a shortage of vitally essential foodstuffs, the result would be frantic profiteering and prices would be inflated to what is called monopoly or famine prices, and only a few top people, with incomes considerably above the average, would be able to satisfy their needs at these fantastic prices, while the vast majority of the people would starve. That is what it means when there is a food shortage in the country, when the country is in a state of famine. Ever since the imperialists began to march on Russia, she has been surrounded. They cannot come out openly with their predatory plans; but that does not mean the end of their intervention, as Comrade Kamenev has rightly remarked. We are a besieged country, a besieged fortress. In this besieged fortress want is inevitable. And therefore the Food Commissariat's job is the most difficult organisational job of all the Commissariats.

Our enemy today, if we take the enemy within, is not so much the capitalist or landowner—this exploiting minority was easy to vanquish, and it has been. It is the profiteer and the bureaucrat. And every peasant is a profiteer by inclination, who has a chance to line his pockets taking advantage of the desperate want and agonising famine in the cities and in some of the villages. And you know very well, especially the comrades from the trade unions, that the urge, the tendency to go in for profiteering occurs in the industrial centres, too, when certain goods are not to be had, or are scarce, and that everybody who

manages to lay his hands on them tries to hoard and make a profit out of them. If we were to allow free trade, prices would at once be inflated to fantastic levels, levels beyond the reach of the vast majority of people.

That, comrades, is the situation, and that is why among the less educated people, exhausted as they are and worn out by starvation and suffering, there is a tendency, or an undefined feeling of resentment and anger against the comrades engaged in food supplies. They are all people who cannot think, cannot see further than the end of their noses, and it seems to them that food could be procured somehow. They have heard that there is food in some place or other, that somebody went there and got some—but they are incapable of calculating on a large scale whether there is enough for ten million people, and how much is required for such a number. It seems to them that someone is holding things up, that our food workers are putting obstacles in their way. They do not understand that the food workers are acting like wise and thrifty managers, saying that if you observe the utmost stringency and the utmost organisation, you shall at best, at the very best, be able to maintain a standard that will keep you from starvation, even if it does fall short of sufficiency. This is the position the country is in for we have been cut off from the chief food-supplying centres—Siberia and the Donets region; we have been cut off from fuel and raw material, food for the population and for industry, without which the country is forced to suffer the most desperate agonies.

The food workers are acting like sensible managers. They say we must stick together, which is the only way we can keep going; we must take systematic action against all attempts by individuals acting for themselves only, willing to pay any price to fill their own belly, and who do not give a hang for anything else. We must not think and act individually, each for himself, for that spells ruin. We must combat such tendencies and habits, which have been fostered in all of us, in the millions of working people, by capitalist private enterprise, by the system of working for the market: "I shall sell and make my bit; the more I make the less I shall starve, and the more others will." That is the accursed legacy of private property, which left

the people to starve even when there was enough food in the country, when a measly minority grew rich both on wealth and on poverty, while the people lived in want and perished in the war. That, comrades, is the position with regard to our food policy. That is the economic law which says that when there is a food shortage, frantic profiteering is engendered by every step towards what is called free trade. That is why all talk about free trade, all attempts to encourage it are utterly pernicious and are a retreat, a step back from that socialist constructive work which the Food Commissariat is doing amidst incredible difficulties in a fight against millions of profiteers, whom we have inherited from capitalism with its old petty-bourgeois, private-property maxim: "Every man for himself, and the devil take the hindmost." If we cannot root out this evil, we shall never build socialism.

Only unity, only the closest alliance, achieved in everyday life, in everyday work, where it is hardest of all to achieve—in dividing up a crust of bread when bread is short—will allow us really to build socialism. We know that this cannot be accomplished in a single year, that people who have suffered so long from hunger are tremendously impatient and demand that at least from time to time we retreat from this only correct food policy. And we do have to retreat from it now and then; but we shall not desert or depart from our policy as a whole.

That, comrades, was the situation six months ago, when the food crisis reached its climax, when we had no stocks at all, when the Czech victories had robbed us of the greater part of the Volga region. We had to consent to the pood and a half.¹⁵⁶ This measure cost us a big fight, a sharp fight—both sides were in a very bad state. The food workers said: "Yes, things are grim, but we must not make them worse. By giving relief to a few for a week, we will be making things worse for the millions." Others said: "You are demanding ideal organisation from people who are exhausted and starving; you are demanding the impossible; you must allow some relief, even if it spoils the general policy for a while. This measure will bring new courage, and that is the main thing." That was the plight we were in when we proposed the pood and a half idea. We kept to the general,

fundamental, radical line, but when the position became unbearable, we had to retreat from it to afford at least some temporary relief and preserve the people's courage and morale.

The same thing is happening now, when we are on the border line, when six comparatively easy months are behind us and six hard months are about to begin. To make this clear, let me tell you that during the first half of 1918 the Food Commissariat procured 28,000,000 poods, and during the second half 67,000,000 poods, that is, two and a half times as much. So you can clearly see that the first half-year is one of particularly dire and acute want, whereas the second, owing to the harvest, offers an opportunity of improvement. Now, in 1919, the success of our food organisations, thanks chiefly to the Poor Peasants' Committees in the countryside and the workers' food inspectors in the towns, is immense and has enabled us to procure two and a half times as much grain. But the success of the first year of our work, when a new edifice had to be built and new methods tested, was not and could not have been enough to ensure us supplies for the whole year, although it afforded us a six-month respite. That respite is coming to an end, and another six months are beginning, the most difficult and hardest of all. We must bring all our resources into play to help the workers, to secure them a short respite, to improve their position in every way we can. And it is only natural that the Presidium of the Moscow Soviet and its Chairman, Kamenev, should have been so insistent that we lay down our policy as clearly as possible and make a clear-cut division between monopoly and non-monopoly foodstuffs, which would enable us to attain certain results, if only for a time, so that the workers in the towns and the non-agricultural areas might get at least some slight relief and gain new courage and energy. These are particularly necessary just now, when we are on the eve of these difficult six months, but when there are signs that the forces in the imperialist camp and their attacks on us are slackening off.

Comrade Kamenev, it is true, has mentioned not only signs but facts to show that, in spite of the severe trials and reverses we suffered at Perm, the Red Army is being built on a firm foundation, that it can and will win. The

coming six months, however, will be very difficult, and from the very outset we must therefore do whatever is necessary and possible to alleviate the situation and lay down a clear-cut food policy. That is our most urgent task. There was a conflict over the pood and a half idea among us, the Communists, and it sometimes assumed acute forms. But it has not weakened us. Rather, it has led us to examine our policy in an even more critical and cautious way. There may be mutual recriminations, but we are arriving at a decision which is being adopted rapidly and unanimously, and which, at this difficult juncture, when we are beginning another and trying six months, demands that we once more clarify for ourselves the reason why a situation has arisen which compels us once more to muster all our strength and strain every nerve.

We have had an exceptionally hard year, and we are now on the verge of an even harder six months. But every six months since the German revolution and since the beginning of ferment in Britain and France brings us nearer to the victory not only of the Russian revolution, but of the world revolution as well. That is the situation as it now stands. We have decided to present a draft of the fundamental principles of food policy, which we shall request the All-Russia Central Executive Committee to affirm, so that it may be immediately embodied by the food workers in appropriate decrees that will enable us, those in the centre, the workers of the towns and the non-agricultural areas, to multiply our efforts once more. For in our efforts alone lies the pledge that we shall win, that, though we make certain temporary concessions, necessitated by fatigue and famine, we shall uphold the fundamental principles of our communist food policy and preserve them intact until the time comes when the victory of communism will be complete and world-wide. I shall now read, clause by clause, the motion which the Communist group on the All-Russia Central Executive Committee submits for its consideration:

This joint session of the All-Russia Central Executive Committee, the All-Russia Trade Union Congress, the Moscow Soviet, and representatives of factory committees and trade unions of the city of Moscow hereby lays down the following fundamental principles of food policy and instructs the People's Commissariat of Food to draw up forthwith decrees embodying these principles.

1. The Soviet food policy is confirmed as correct and unassailable, this policy consisting in:

- (a) registration and state distribution on the class principle;
- (b) monopoly of the principal foodstuffs;
- (c) transfer of supply from private hands to state hands.

2. Unless the state monopoly of the chief items of food (bread, sugar, tea and salt) already decreed is strictly enforced, and unless mass procurements of other of the more important foodstuffs (meat, sea-fish, hemp, sunflower-seed and linseed oil, animal fats, except butter, and potatoes) are made by the state at fixed prices, it will be impossible to ensure a regular supply of food to the population under present conditions. Furthermore, such mass procurements at fixed prices are only a preliminary measure, in preparation for a state monopoly of these foodstuffs, too, which will be the next task of the Food Commissariat to introduce.

The procurement and transportation of all foodstuffs enumerated in this clause, with the exception of potatoes, are forbidden to all but the state food bodies. The right to mass procurement of potatoes at the established fixed prices shall, in addition to state bodies, be granted also to workers' organisations, trade unions and co-operative societies.

3. As a temporary measure, workers' organisations and co-operative societies shall be granted the right to procure all foodstuffs other than those enumerated in Clause 2.

4. The local food bodies are hereby compelled to assist the food-procuring organisations in the exercise of this right.

From the standpoint of old habits and the old idea of government, the use of the word "compelled" may surprise you. You may perhaps say: "Can things be so bad in the Soviet Republic that people have to be compelled to obey the will of the All-Russia Central Executive Committee?" Yes, we have to compel, and it is better to say so frankly than to hide our heads under our wing and pretend everything is going swimmingly. Just let our comrades, the representatives of the All-Russia Central Executive Committee and the delegates at the All-Russia Trade Union Congress, give good thought to what they say among themselves. Let them give a thought to whether they are properly carrying out everything decreed long ago concerning the proper registration of foodstuffs and the full delivery to the state of those foodstuffs which cannot be left for commodity exchange purposes. When there is no commodity exchange the peasants say: "No, you'll get nothing from us for your Kerensky money." If you give a thought to what you say in private among yourselves and bear in mind how many of the orders of the central authorities remain unful-

filled, you must admit it is better to tell the truth and say that our local bodies have to be compelled, firmly and ruthlessly. (*Applause.*) At this meeting, in which the All-Russia Central Executive Committee, as our supreme body, has come together with the All-Russia Trade Union Congress bodies, which have the most numerous representation—and that just now is the main thing—these most influential comrades must firmly say, and make it known in their localities, that the local bodies must get accustomed to the idea that we have to compel them to carry out the policy of the central authorities consistently. That is very difficult, and it is natural that many millions of people, who are accustomed to looking on the central authorities as robbers, landowners, exploiters, can have no trust in the centre. But this distrust must be overcome. Socialism cannot be built if it is not, for that means building a centralised economic system, an economic system directed from the centre, and that can only be done by the proletariat, which has been trained in this spirit by the factory and by its whole mode of life. Only the proletariat can do this. The fight against parochial tendencies, against the habits of the small property-owner, is a difficult one. We know this cannot be done all at once, but we shall never tire of urging the workers to reiterate this truth and put it into practice, for socialism cannot be built otherwise.

Clause 4 explains further:

The transportation and marketing of these foodstuffs shall be absolutely unrestricted. No pickets, cordons, guards, etc., shall have the right to prevent the unrestricted transportation and sale of the said foodstuffs in bazaars or markets, from carts, etc.

This point is particularly important. Comrade Kamenev has mentioned many things here which, naturally, in the haste of our work, we have not carried out; our Food and other Commissariats have to issue one order on top of another, with the result that our local bodies find it very difficult to get them all straight. We are accused of issuing decrees too hastily; but what are we to do when we have to make haste because of the advance of imperialism, when we are compelled to make haste by the strongest scourge imaginable—the lack of bread and fuel. This being so, we must use every means to explain our tasks, to elucidate particular mistakes, and that is why the clear and precise demarcation

now achieved by this struggle is so important. To achieve this on a far larger scale we must now make sure that the local bodies do not act as if they are a law to themselves, that they do not dare to plead they remembered yesterday's decree but forgot today's. We must make sure they know quite clearly and definitely which foodstuffs are a state monopoly, and which are open to unrestricted transportation and sale—that is everything except what is specifically enumerated in clauses 1 and 2. Let this be made generally known. Let those who are now about to return home convey it to the localities. Let them do what their official position requires of them. Let them take along with them copies of the decrees that will be drawn up on the subject, so that these may be implicitly obeyed and carried out in the localities, so that the orders of the centre may really be carried out, and the former indecision stopped.

Further, the end of Clause 4 reads:

Note. With respect to eggs and butter, this decision shall apply only to districts where mass procurements of eggs and butter are not made by the Food Commissariat.

Comrades, I am now going to read the remaining clauses of the decree in brief. As I am unable to go into detail, and as there is no need to do so since several other comrades, some of them better qualified than myself, will speak after me, I shall only stress what I consider most important. I shall read only the basic principles which we recommend the All-Russia Central Executive Committee to adopt and instruct the Council of People's Commissars and all other authorities of the Soviet Republic to embody in decrees and carry out unreservedly and implicitly. (*Applause.*)

5. With a view to increasing procurements, and to the more efficient performance of individual tasks, the principle of surplus appropriation and procurement shall be extended to non-monopoly foodstuffs, and a bonus system introduced for co-operative and other organisations engaged in procuring both monopoly and non-monopoly produce for the state.

Measures of organisation for introducing fresh forces into the food bodies and for the wider participation of workers:

(a) Workers' food inspectors shall be widely utilised and their functions extended to include control over the way the December 10 decrees are observed by the food bodies, and over the procurement of non-monopoly foodstuffs;

(b) Workers' inspection shall be introduced at the earliest possible date in all food bodies in the localities and extended to the Food Commissariat departments, with the object of vigorously combating bureaucracy and red tape;

(c) Connections with the workers' organisations—trade unions and workers' co-operative societies—shall be strengthened by reinforcing the local bodies with active members of the aforesaid organisations;

(d) A system of workers' trainees shall be introduced in all central and local bodies and institutions in order to train workers as practical specialists in food affairs capable of filling responsible posts.

6. The co-operative apparatus shall be employed to the full in the work of procurement and distribution. Responsible representatives of the state supply bodies shall be appointed to the co-operative societies to control the activities of the co-operative organisations and coordinate them with the government's food policy.

That, incidentally, is one of the ways of fighting the top people in the co-operatives. But it would be a great mistake and positively fatal to scorn the entire co-operative apparatus, to reject it out of hand or in a contemptuous way, saying: "We shall build ourselves a new one; this is no business of ours, this is something for Communists only." We must make use of the machinery ready at hand—we cannot build socialism unless we utilise what capitalism has left us. We must utilise everything in the way of cultural values capitalism created against our interests. Therein lies the difficulty of socialism, that it has to be built of materials made by our adversaries; but therein lies the only possibility for socialism. We all know this theoretically, and now that we have got over this year, we have seen in practice that socialism can only be built from what capitalism has created against our interests, and that we must employ all this to build and consolidate socialism.

Clause 7 reads:

7. Supervision to ensure the proper observance of the regulations governing the transportation of foodstuffs and the strict enforcement of the monopolies shall devolve on the workers, aided by armed detachments formed by the Food Commissariat.

All food pickets other than the teams of the Food Commissariat and the Gubernia Food Committees shall be withdrawn immediately. The teams of the Food Commissariat and the Gubernia Food Committees shall be withdrawn as and when the respective bodies of workers' inspectors are formed in the localities.

My time is up, comrades, and I shall only point out that here, in these last clauses, we find the main principles

underlying our food policy and Soviet policy in general. I have already said that hard times have come, that a more drastic six months has begun, that the respite in food difficulties is over and a most difficult period has commenced. Every time the Soviet government encounters difficulties in the extremely difficult job of building socialism, it knows only one way to overcome them, and that is to turn to the workers, to wider and wider sections of the workers every time. I have already said socialism can be built only when ten and a hundred times more people themselves begin to build the state and the new economic life. Our food workers have, as their reports show, already got to a stage where no less than one-third of the members of the district food committees are workers, chiefly workers from Petrograd, Moscow and Ivanovo-Voznesensk—the flower of our proletarian army. That is good, but it is not enough. What we need is two-thirds, and we must go on working for it. As you know, the advanced sections of the workers have already set about governing the state, building a new life. We know we must reach down deeper and more boldly enlist new sections. They still lack training, they will inevitably make mistakes, but we are not afraid of that. We know that in this way we shall get young trained workers and recompense errors a hundredfold by securing scores of younger and fresher forces. There is no other source we can draw on. We must move ahead all the time, take our young workers from wherever we can and put them in more and more responsible posts.

The present food crisis is due to the fact that a more difficult six months has begun. It is also due to the state of transport. As I have already said, in the second half of 1918 we procured 67,500,000 poods. But we were unable to get out 20,000,000 of this amount. The latest severe crisis in Petrograd is due to the fact that our stocks are held up on the Volga-Bugulma Railway, and we cannot move them out. The railways are in a desperate state. The rolling stock is in a dreadful state, because no country has suffered so badly as Russia owing to her prevailing backwardness, and because the rail workers are not so well organised. I would ask you, on leaving this meeting, to make the people aware of our need for numerous workers for food organisation and

the railways, who would help us with their experience. Give them a job, keep an eye on the novices, and they will do a lot more than the old organisations. Everybody on food and transport work! Let every organisation, no matter which branch it belongs to, review all its forces and ask itself whether it has taken enough men, whether it has done all it should in the way of sending commissars, as we send them for the army. The workers are suffering from lack of food. We must put our best people on the job, appoint them all to responsible military, food or transport posts. Everybody can be of use here, even if he is not an expert. On the railways it is sometimes the aid of a Party comrade that is required, the influence of an ideologically staunch proletarian who has had his schooling and will influence the less proletarian sections of railway employees by control and supervision. Comrades, I once more repeat the slogan: "Everybody on food and transport work!" We must do what we did in the army, where we sent our political commissars and achieved the tasks we set ourselves. I am sure we shall this time, too, in these difficult six months, conquer famine and devastation!

Brief report published in
Izvestia No. 12, January 18, 1919

Published according to
the verbatim report

**SPEECH AT THE MOSCOW CITY CONFERENCE
OF THE RUSSIAN COMMUNIST PARTY (BOLSHEVIKS)
JANUARY 18, 1919¹⁵⁷**

BRIEF NEWSPAPER REPORT

As far as I can see from the resolutions, from the two drafts submitted after the discussion on the relations between centre and districts—the first for improving Soviet affairs, and the second for completely reconstructing the Soviet apparatus—the second, contained in the motion of a group of comrades, gives the impression that something is lacking, inasmuch as no definite grounds exist for the change in the Soviet apparatus proposed in this resolution.

Our enemy today is bureaucracy and profiteering. We cannot see the improvements for the devastation. But the devastation can be overcome only by centralisation, by foregoing purely local interests. It looks like it is these interests that have given rise to the opposition to centralism, which, nevertheless, is the only way out of our present predicament. The group of comrades who submitted this resolution are abandoning centralism for the quagmire of localism.

The districts appear to be dissatisfied because certain decisions of the central Soviet authorities are being taken without consulting them. If that is so, the districts have every right to convene conferences to discuss all questions in which they are interested. We are being ground down by red tape, which is very difficult to cope with. It has to be vigorously fought, and more workingmen have to be appointed to government offices. But when the attack on red tape is directed to the wrong quarter, things become very dangerous, as, for example, in relation to

specialists. The reason we are in a bad way is not because we have got a lot of specialists, but because we have not got strict centralisation. There are fields of Soviet work which suffer from a shortage of specialists. We must appoint more workers of average qualifications to the government offices, who would learn their jobs from the specialists and be able to replace them eventually and do the practical work independently. Thus, it is evident that the theses submitted by Comrade Ignatov do not say what these comrades really want. The attack is being levied at the wrong quarter.

Pravda No. 19,
January 28, 1919

Published according to
the *Pravda* text

SPEECH AT THE SECOND ALL-RUSSIA CONGRESS
OF INTERNATIONALIST TEACHERS***
JANUARY 18, 1919

(Stormy applause passing into ovation.) Comrades, greetings to your Congress on behalf of the Council of People's Commissars. The teachers are now faced with tasks of the highest importance. I hope that after the year we have just been through, after a year of struggle, after what has taken place in international affairs, the struggle that has been going on among the teachers—between those who took their stand from the very first with the Soviet government to work for the socialist revolution, and those who have so far stood by the old system, by the old prejudices that teaching can continue to be based on the old system—must come to an end, and is in fact coming to an end. There can be no doubt that the vast majority of teachers, who stand close to the working class and the working peasants, are now convinced that the socialist revolution is deeply rooted and is inevitably spreading all over the world. And I think that now the vast majority of teachers will quite sincerely come over to the side of the government of working and exploited people in the struggle for the socialist revolution and against those teachers who still stand by the old bourgeois prejudices, the old system and hypocrisies, and imagine that some part of that system can be salvaged.

One of these bourgeois hypocrisies is the belief that the school can stand aloof from politics. You know very well how false this belief is. The bourgeoisie themselves, who advocated this principle, made their own bourgeois politics the cornerstone of the school system, and tried to reduce

schooling to the training of docile and efficient servants of the bourgeoisie, to reduce even universal education from top to bottom to the training of docile and efficient servants of the bourgeoisie, of slaves and tools of capital. They never gave a thought to making the school a means of developing the human personality. And now it is clear to all that this can be done only by socialist schools, which have inseparable bonds with all the working and exploited people and wholeheartedly support Soviet policy.

Of course, the reconstruction of education is no easy matter. And, naturally, mistakes have been and still are being made, as are attempts to misinterpret the principle of the ties between education and politics and to give it a crude and distorted meaning. Awkward attempts are being made to put politics into the minds of the younger generation when they have not been prepared enough for it. Undoubtedly, we shall always have to combat such crude applications of this basic principle. But today the chief task of those members of the teaching profession who have sided with the International and the Soviet government is to work for the creation of a wider and, as nearly as possible, an all-embracing teachers' union.

There is no place in your union, the union of internationalists, for the old teachers' union, which clung to bourgeois prejudices and revealed a lack of understanding. It has been fighting longest of all to uphold these privileges, longer even than other top unions, which were formed at the very beginning of the 1917 revolution and which we combated in all spheres of life. In my opinion, your internationalist union may very well become a single school-teachers' trade union, siding, like all the other trade unions—as has been very clearly shown by the Second All-Russia Trade Union Congress—with Soviet government policy. The task facing the teachers is immense. They have to combat the survivals of the slackness and disunity left by the last revolution.

Next, as regards propaganda and agitation. It is only natural that disunity should still prevail in every sphere of propaganda and education when we consider the lack of confidence in the teachers caused by the sabotage and prejudices of the bourgeois section of the teaching body,

who are accustomed to thinking that only the rich are entitled to real education, while the majority of the working people need only be trained to be good servants and good workers, but not real masters of life. This condemns a section of the teachers to a narrow sphere, the sphere of pseudo-education, and has prevented us from properly creating a single apparatus in which all scholastic forces would merge and collaborate with us. We shall only succeed when we discard the old bourgeois prejudices. This is where it is your union's task to draw the broad mass of teachers into your family, to educate the most backward sections of the teaching profession, to bring them under general proletarian policy, and weld them together into one common organisation.

In trade union organisation, the teachers have a big job on their hands with our country in its present predicament, when all the issues of the Civil War are becoming quite clear, and when the petty-bourgeois democratic people are being compelled by the logic of events to come over to the Soviet government. For they have seen for themselves that any other course will, whether they like it or not, drive them towards defending the whiteguards and international imperialism. Now that the whole world is faced with one cardinal task, the issue is: either extreme reaction, military dictatorship and shootings—of which we have had striking illustrations from Berlin—either this vicious reaction from the capitalist brutes who feel they will not go unpunished for these four years of war, and are therefore prepared to go to any lengths, to go on drenching the earth in the blood of the working people, or the complete victory of the working people in a socialist revolution. Today there can be no middle course. Hence, those teachers who sided with the International from the very first, and who now clearly perceive that their opponents among the teachers of the other camp cannot put up any serious resistance, must launch into far wider activities. Your union should now become a broad teachers' trade union embracing vast numbers of teachers, a union which will resolutely stand by Soviet policy and the struggle for socialism through the dictatorship of the proletariat.

This is the formula adopted by the Second Trade Union Congress now in session. The Congress demands that every-

one engaged in a given trade, in a given sphere of activity, should join a single union. At the same time it declares that the trade union movement cannot hold aloof from the fundamental tasks of the struggle for the emancipation of labour from capital. And, consequently, only those unions which recognise the revolutionary class struggle for socialism by the dictatorship of the proletariat can be full and equal members of the trade unions. Your union is a union of this kind. If you stand by that position, you will be sure of success in winning over the greater bulk of the teachers and in working to make knowledge and science no longer something for the privileged, no longer a medium for reinforcing the position of the rich and exploiters, but a weapon for the emancipation of the working and exploited people. Allow me to wish you every success in this endeavour.

Short report published
in *Izvestia* No. 13,
January 19, 1910

Published according to
the verbatim report

SPEECH AT A PROTEST RALLY FOLLOWING
THE MURDER OF KARL LIEBKNECHT
AND ROSA LUXEMBURG
JANUARY 19, 1919¹⁴
BRIEF NEWSPAPER REPORT

Today the bourgeoisie and the social-traitors are jubilating in Berlin—they have succeeded in murdering Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg. Ebert and Scheidemann, who for four years led the workers to the slaughter for the sake of depredation, have now assumed the role of butchers of the proletarian leaders. The example of the German revolution proves that “democracy” is only a camouflage for bourgeois robbery and the most savage violence.

Death to the butchers!

Pravda No. 14,
January 21, 1919

Published according to
the *Pravda* text

**REPORT AT THE SECOND ALL-RUSSIA
TRADE UNION CONGRESS¹⁶⁰
JANUARY 20, 1919**

(Stormy, prolonged applause.) Comrades, owing to a slight indisposition, I must first ask you to excuse me for having to confine myself today to only a few remarks on the question now put before you—the tasks of the trade unions.

The resolution now before you has been submitted to the Trade Union Congress by the Communist group, which has given it thorough deliberation. As the resolution has already been printed, I presume that all present are acquainted with it, and I shall therefore dwell only on two main points, which in my opinion are the most significant of those dealt with, generally speaking, in this resolution.

I think that the first of these points, a negative one, so to speak, is the statement regarding the slogan of unity or independence of the trade union movement. Clause 3 of the resolution refers to this slogan, saying that in practice it has led the groups behind this slogan to an open struggle against the Soviet government, and that this attempt has placed them outside the bounds of the working class.

This notorious independence slogan deserves attention, I think, from more than the trade union standpoint. In my opinion, only if we realise that the independence slogan is self-deception for some people and plain deception for others, can the struggle over the issue of dictatorship of the proletariat or dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, which is now going on all over the world and which is obviously coming to a head with fantastic speed, be properly understood and properly reckoned with, and enable the working class,

its class-conscious representatives, to take a proper part in this struggle. First of all, I should like to point out, if only briefly, how false this slogan is theoretically, and how open it is to criticism from the theoretical point of view.

What has lately happened in Germany, the brutal and treacherous murder of Liebknecht and Luxemburg, is not merely the most dramatic and tragic event in the revolution beginning in Germany. It is something more. It sheds an extraordinarily vivid light on the way the problems of the present-day struggle are presented by the various trends of political thought and in the various theoretical systems of today. It was from Germany that we heard most talk, for example, on the celebrated subject of democracy, on the slogan of democracy in general, and on the slogan that the working class must be independent of government. These slogans may at first glance seem to be unconnected, but they are actually very closely connected. They are closely connected because they show how strong petty-bourgeois prejudices are to this day, despite the proletariat's immense experience of the class struggle; how to this day often lip service is paid to the class struggle which is not recognised by the minds or hearts of those who talk about it. Indeed, if we recall even the rudiments of political economy as we learnt it from Marx's *Capital*, that theory of the class struggle by which we all firmly stand, how can there be any talk of democracy in general or independence when the struggle has grown as acute and far-flung as it is today, when it is clear that the socialist revolution is facing the whole world, and when this has been palpably demonstrated in the most democratic countries? Whoever thinks there can show that, as far as the theory of political economy is concerned, he has not understood a single page of Marx's *Capital*, by which all socialists without exception now swear.

But, as a matter of fact, although they swear by this work, now that they are on the verge of that cardinal struggle to which Marx's *Capital* led, they retreat from this class struggle and imagine there can be an extra-class or above-class democracy. They imagine that in modern society, while the capitalists still retain their property, there can be a democracy other than bourgeois democracy, that is,

other than a bourgeois dictatorship masked by false and hypocritical democratic labels. It was from this very Germany that we recently heard voices saying that over there the dictatorship of the proletariat, possibly, in fact most probably, would not transcend the bounds of democracy, that there democracy would remain. It was there that people who claim to be teachers of Marxism, people who from 1889 to 1914 were the ideologists of the entire Second International, people like Kautsky, unfurled the banner of democracy and failed to understand that as long as property remains in the hands of the capitalists democracy is nothing but a thoroughly hypocritical cover for the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. They failed to understand that there cannot be any serious question of the emancipation of labour from capital as long as this hypocritical cover is not torn away. Not as long as we do not put the question as Marx always taught us to put it, and as we have been taught to put it by the proletariat's day-to-day struggle, by every strike and by every acute turn in the trade union struggle—namely, that while property remains in the hands of the capitalists, all democracy will be nothing but a hypocritical cover for the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. All talk about universal suffrage, about the popular will and about equality at the polls will be a sheer fraud, for there can be no equality between the exploiter and the exploited, between the owner of capital and property and the modern wage-slave.

Of course, compared with tsarism, absolutism, monarchy and all feudal survivals, bourgeois democracy historically denotes immense progress. Of course, we shall have to utilise it. And until the time comes for the struggle of the working class for full power it is incumbent on us to make use of the forms of bourgeois democracy. But the fact is that we have now arrived at this decisive moment of the struggle internationally. For the issue now is whether the capitalists can maintain their power over the means of production and, above all, their ownership of the implements of production. And this means they are preparing for new wars. The imperialist war has quite clearly demonstrated how capitalist property is connected with that slaughter of the nations, how it led up to it irresistibly and inexorably. But that being so, all talk of democracy

expressing the popular will is obviously sheer deception, nothing but the privilege of the capitalists and the rich to dupe the more backward sections of the working people both through their press, which remains in the hands of the property-owners, and by all other means of political influence.

There is and can be only one alternative: either the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, disguised by constituent assemblies, all kinds of voting systems, democracy and similar bourgeois frauds that are used to blind fools, and that only people who have become utter renegades from Marxism and socialism all along the line can make play of today—or the dictatorship of the proletariat for suppressing with an iron hand the bourgeoisie, who are inciting the most backward elements against the finest leaders of the world proletariat. This dictatorship means the victory of the proletariat for the purpose of suppressing the bourgeoisie, who are now putting up a most desperate resistance, which gets all the more furious the more clearly the bourgeoisie perceive that it is the people that have raised this issue. Previously, in the vast majority of cases, they regarded dissatisfaction and indignation among the workers as only a temporary expression of discontent. That, in fact, is the way the matter is quite often regarded to this day by the British capitalists, for example, who are perhaps the most experienced in deceiving the workers politically, and politically the best trained and the best organised. They realise that the war has, of course, led to discontent, and that this discontent inevitably gives rise and will continue to give rise to unrest among the workers. But, they argue, the workers have not yet said who is to head the state, who is to hold state power, and whether the capitalists are to be allowed to retain their property. But events have shown that this is undoubtedly a pressing issue not only in Russia, but in a number of West-European countries as well, and, what is more, not only in countries which took part in the war, but in neutral countries, too, which have suffered relatively little, such as Switzerland and Holland.

The bourgeoisie have above all been brought up, and have trained the people, in the spirit of bourgeois parliamentarism. Yet it has become perfectly clear that a Soviet

movement, a movement for Soviet government, has been ripening among the people. The Soviet movement has ceased to be a Russian form of the power of the proletariat; it has become the policy of the international proletariat in its struggle for power. It has become the second step in the world-wide development of the socialist revolution. The first step was the Paris Commune, which showed that the working class cannot arrive at socialism except by way of dictatorship, by the forcible suppression of the exploiters. That is the first thing the Paris Commune showed, namely, that the working class cannot get to socialism via the old, bourgeois-democratic parliamentary state, but only via a new type of state, which will smash both parliamentarism and the bureaucracy from top to bottom.

The second step from the point of view of the world-wide development of the socialist revolution was the Soviet government. It was at first considered a purely Russian phenomenon—as it might well have been, and was in fact bound to have been when judged only by the facts. But today events have shown that it is also the international form of the struggle of the proletariat. The wars which have reshuffled the proletarian and semi-proletarian masses have furnished them with a new form of organisation which is patently in direct opposition to rapacious imperialism, to the capitalist class and its fabulous profits, profits without precedent before the war. The wars have everywhere created these new mass fighting organisations, organisations of the proletariat for the overthrow of the power of the bourgeoisie.

Not everybody realised that this in fact was what the Soviets signified when they came into being. Not everybody realises it even today. But to us the picture could not be clearer for we saw the germs of these Soviets in 1905 and, after the February Revolution of 1917, we witnessed a long period of hesitation and vacillation between the Soviet organisation of the people and the compromising, treacherous, petty-bourgeois ideology. It lies before us as though in the palm of our hand, and it is with this picture in mind—and knowing the way the struggle of the proletariat against capitalist property for state power has developed and is growing wider and deeper every day—that we approach

the matter. And knowing this, what is the sense of all the references to democracy and all talk about "independence" and suchlike, which are constantly tending towards some classless position? We know that in capitalist society it is the bourgeoisie that rule, that capitalist society in fact arises from the bourgeoisie's political and economic power. Either the power of the proletariat or dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, there is no middle course on issues of any seriousness for any length of time. And anyone who talks about independence, about democracy in general, consciously or unconsciously presupposes something intermediate, something standing between classes or above classes. In every case that is self-deception or deception of others. It serves to conceal the fact that as long as capitalist power remains, as long as the capitalists retain the ownership of the means of production, democracy may be broad or narrow, more or less civilised, and so on and so forth, but it actually remains dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, and all the more obviously and palpably does civil war spurt from every big contradiction.

The nearer the French political forms are to democracy, the more easily something like the Dreyfus case causes civil war. The broader democracy is in America, with its proletariat, its internationalists, and even pure pacifists, the more easily cases of lynching and outbreaks of civil war arise. The meaning of this is even clearer now, when the first week of bourgeois freedom, of democracy, in Germany has led to a most frenzied outbreak of civil war, far more acute and far more desperate than in our country.

And whoever judges these outbreaks from the point of view of whether proceedings were brought by parties, whoever judges them simply from the point of view of the murder of Liebknecht and Luxemburg, reveals blindness and intellectual cowardice, refusing to understand that these are outbreaks of an irresistible civil war, a war that springs irresistibly from all the contradictions of capitalism. There is not and cannot be any middle course. All talk of independence or democracy in general, no matter what sauce it may be served up with, is a sheer fraud and a downright betrayal of socialism. And if the theoretical propaganda of the Bolsheviks, who are now the virtual founders of the

International, if the theoretical teaching of the Bolsheviks on civil war did not reach very far and was all too often halted by obstacles of censorship and the military barrages of the imperialist states, today it is no longer the teaching, no longer the theory, but the facts of civil war that are becoming all the more violent the older the democracy of the West-European states and the longer it has lasted. These facts will pierce even the hardest and most obtuse skulls. The people who talk about democracy in general, about independence, may now be called fossils.

Nevertheless, bearing in mind the difficult conditions of the struggle in which the trade union movement of Russia has so recently arisen and grown up—and it has now almost reached full growth—we must, in passing, glance back and recall recent events. Such recollections and reminders are, I think, all the more necessary since the trade union movement, as such, is having to undergo a particularly abrupt change now that world-wide socialist revolution has begun.

It was in the trade union movement especially that the ideologists of the bourgeoisie tried to fish in troubled waters. They endeavoured to make the economic struggle, which is the basis of the trade union movement, independent of the political struggle. But now, precisely now, especially after the political revolution, which has transferred power to the proletariat, the time has come for the trade unions, as the broadest organisation of the proletariat on a class scale, to play a very great role, to take the centre of the political stage, to become, in a sense, the chief political organ. For all the old concepts and categories of politics have been upset and reversed by the political revolution which has turned power over to the proletariat. The old state, even the best and most democratic bourgeois republics, was never, I repeat, and never could be, anything but the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, that is, of those who own the factories, the implements of production, the land, the railways—in a word, all the material means, all the instruments of labour, without the possession of which labour remains in slavery.

That is why, when political power passed into the proletariat's hands the trade unions had increasingly to take on the task of builders of working-class politics, the task

of people whose class organisation was to replace the old exploiting class after upsetting all the old traditions and prejudices of the old science which, in the words of one scholar, told the proletariat: "You look after your economic affairs and the party of the bourgeoisie will look after politics." All these ideas have proved to be a direct weapon in the hands of the exploiting class and its thugs for keeping down the proletariat, which is beginning to revolt and struggle everywhere.

And here the trade unions must take up an entirely new question in their state organisation work—the question of "governmentalising" the trade unions, as it is termed in the Communist group's resolution. In this connection the trade unions must give very serious thought to the profound and famous words of the founders of modern communism to the effect that "the broader and deeper the revolution going on in society, the larger should be the number of people who make the revolution, who are its makers in the true sense of the word".¹⁶¹ Take the old society of the feudal nobility. There revolutions were absurdly easy, as long as it was only a matter of taking power from one handful of nobles or feudal lords and turning it over to another. Take bourgeois society, which boasts of its universal suffrage. In actual fact, as we know, this universal suffrage, this whole machine, becomes a fraud, for even in the most advanced, cultured and democratic countries the overwhelming majority of the working people are downtrodden and crushed—crushed by the hell of capitalism, so that actually they do not and cannot take any part in politics.

Now for the first time in history a revolution has begun which can lead to the complete victory of socialism—provided only that new and large masses of people set about the work of governing independently. The socialist revolution does not imply a change in the form of state, not the replacement of a monarchy by a republic, nor new elections in which people are assumed to be absolutely "equal" but which are actually nothing but an artificial obfuscation, a screen for the fact that some own property and others do not. From the point of view of bourgeois society, once there is "democracy", and once capitalist and proletarian alike take part in the voting, this is the "popular will",

this is "equality" and an expression of the people's will. We know what an abominable fraud this talk is, which only serves as a cover for butchers and murderers like Ebert and Scheidemann. In bourgeois society, the mass of the working people are governed by the bourgeoisie with the help of more or less democratic forms. They are governed by a minority, the property-owners, those who have a share in capitalist property and who have turned education and science, that supreme bulwark and flower of capitalist civilisation, into an instrument of exploitation, into a monopoly, in order to keep the overwhelming majority of the people in slavery. The revolution we have begun and have been making for two years, and which we are firmly determined to carry through to the end (*applause*), is possible and feasible only provided we manage to transfer power to the new class, provided the bourgeoisie, the capitalist slaveowners, the bourgeois intellectuals, the representatives of all the owners and property-holders are replaced by the new class in all spheres of government, in all state affairs, in the entire business of running the new life, from top to bottom. (*Applause.*)

That is the task before us now. The socialist revolution can only be lasting when this new class learns, not from books, not from meetings or lectures, but from the practical work of government. Only when it enlists the vast mass of working people for this work, when it elaborates forms which will enable all working people to adapt themselves easily to the work of governing the state and establishing law and order. Only on this condition is the socialist revolution bound to be lasting. Given this condition, it will constitute a force which will brush away capitalism and all its survivals as easily as straw or dust.

From the class standpoint, generally speaking, that is the task before us as a condition for the victory of the socialist revolution. It is a task closely and directly associated with the tasks of those organisations which even under capitalist society worked for the broadest possible mass struggle to destroy that society. And of the organisations that then existed, the trade unions were the broadest. And now, while formally remaining independent organisations, they can and should, as one of the passages in the resolution

before you states, take an active part in the work of the Soviet government by directly working in all government bodies, by organising mass control over their activities, etc., and by setting up new bodies for the registration, control and regulation of all production and distribution, relying on the organised initiative of the broad mass of the interested working people themselves.

The trade unions have never embraced more than one-fifth of the wage-workers in capitalist society, even under the most favourable circumstances, even in the most advanced countries, after decades and sometimes even centuries of development of bourgeois-democratic civilisation and culture. Only a small upper section were members, and of them only a very few were lured over and bribed by the capitalists to take their place in capitalist society as workers' leaders. The American socialists called these people "labour lieutenants of the capitalist class". In that country of the freest bourgeois culture, in that most democratic of bourgeois republics, they saw most clearly the role played by this tiny upper section of the proletariat who had virtually entered the service of the bourgeoisie as its deputies, who were bribed and bought by it, and who came to form those groups of social-patriots and defence advocates of which Ebert and Scheidemann will always remain the perfect heroes.

In our country things are now different. The trade unions are in a position to start the economic development of the state on new lines, making use of everything created by capitalist culture and capitalist production. They can build socialism on that material basis, on that large-scale industry, whose burden used to weigh on us, which was created against our interests, was made for the endless oppression of the working people, but which united and welded them, and thus created the vanguard of the new society. And since the October Revolution, since the transfer of power to the proletariat, this vanguard has begun to perform its real task—to educate the working and exploited people, to enlist them in the work of governing the state and administering industry without officials, without the bourgeoisie and without capitalists. That is why the resolution we submit to you rejects all bourgeois plans and

all that treacherous talk. That is why it declares the governmentalisation of the trade unions to be unavoidable. It also takes a step forward. We are no longer raising the question of the governmentalisation of the trade unions merely in its theoretical aspect. We have, thank God, passed the stage when such questions were raised purely as subjects for theoretical discussion. We may even forget at times the days when we used to engage in such free discussions on purely theoretical themes. Those times have long since passed, and today we are raising these questions on the basis of a year's experience of the trade unions, which, in their role as organisers of production, have created such organisations as the Supreme Economic Council. In this incredibly difficult business, the trade unions have committed innumerable blunders, and constantly still are committing them, but they are not deterred by the malicious sneers of the bourgeoisie, who say the proletarians decided to do things themselves and are making a mess of it.

The bourgeoisie imagine they made no blunders when they took over from the tsar and the nobles. They imagine the 1861 Reform, which attempted to repair the edifice of serfdom, and left power and abundant sources of revenue in the hands of the serfowners, went off quite smoothly and that it was not followed by chaos in Russia for several decades. There is no country in the world in which the nobility did not scoff at the upstart bourgeoisie and commoners when they set out to govern the state.

It goes without saying that the entire flower, or, rather, sterile blossom, of the bourgeois intellectuals is now also scoffing at every mistake the new government is making, especially since the new class, the alliance of all working people, has had to make its revolution at a furious rate because of the frantic resistance of the exploiters and the campaign of the world alliance of exploiters against Russia—one of the weakest and least prepared of countries. We had to act under conditions in which we had to think not so much of making the course of revolution smooth, as of holding on as best we could until the West-European proletariat came to life. We have accomplished this task. In this respect, we can already say we have done far better than the men who made the French Revolution, which

was defeated by an alliance of monarchical and backward countries. The French Revolution, in the form of the power of the lower ranks of the bourgeoisie of that time, held on for a year only, and did not at once evoke a similar movement in other countries. Nevertheless, it did so much for the bourgeoisie, for the bourgeois democracy, that the entire development of civilised humanity throughout the nineteenth century sprang from the great French Revolution, and was indebted to it for everything.

We have done much better. What was done in a year for the development of the bourgeois democracy at that time, we have done on a far larger scale for the new proletarian regime in about the same time. And we have done it so successfully that already now the movement in Russia, whose beginning was due to a special set of circumstances rather than any merit of ours, to special conditions that put Russia between two imperialist giants of the modern civilised world—that the effect of this movement and the victory of the Soviet system during the past year has been to make the movement international. The Communist International has been founded, the slogans and ideals of the old bourgeois democracy have been shattered, and today there is no intelligent politician anywhere in the world, whatever his party may be, who can fail to see that the world socialist revolution has begun, really is taking place. (*Applause.*)

I have digressed somewhat in speaking about how we have left the theoretical aspect of the question far behind and are now about to tackle its practical solution. We have had a year's experience, and we have already accomplished incomparably more for the victory of the proletariat and its revolution than was accomplished by a year's dictatorship of bourgeois democrats for the victory of bourgeois democracy all over the world at the end of the century before last. But, besides this, we have, during this year, acquired a vast amount of practical experience. This enables us, if not to calculate every one of our steps with absolute precision, at least to indicate the rate of development, its speed, to see its practical difficulties and take the practical steps which will lead from one partial victory in overthrowing the bourgeoisie to another.

Looking back, we can see the mistakes we have to correct. We can clearly see what we have to build and how we have to build in the future. That is why our resolution is not confined to proclaiming the governmentalisation of the trade unions, to proclaiming the dictatorship of the proletariat in principle and the need for us to proceed, as one passage in the resolution states, "inevitably to the fusion of the trade union organisations with state bodies". That we already know from theory, we outlined it before October, and we should have outlined it even sooner. But it is not enough. The whole crux of the question has changed for a party which is now about to tackle the practical job of building socialism, for trade unions which have already set up bodies to run industry on a countrywide, state scale, which have already formed a Supreme Economic Council, and which have at a cost of thousands of mistakes acquired thousands of useful bits of experience in organisation.

Today we can no longer confine ourselves to proclaiming the dictatorship of the proletariat. The trade unions have to be governmentalised; they have to be fused with state bodies. The work of building up large-scale industry has to be entrusted entirely to them. But all that is not enough.

We must also learn from our practical experience to determine the next immediate step. That is the essence of our task just now. And that is what the resolution has in mind when it says that if the trade unions were arbitrarily to attempt to take over government functions now, they would only make a mess of it. We have suffered enough from this sort of thing. We have fought hard enough against the survivals of the accursed bourgeois system, against the anarchistic and selfish tendencies of the small holder, which are so deeply ingrained even among the workers.

The workers were never separated by a Great Wall of China from the old society. And they have preserved a good deal of the traditional mentality of capitalist society. The workers are building a new society without themselves having become new people, or cleansed of the filth of the old world; they are still standing up to their knees in that filth. We can only dream of clearing the filth away. It would be utterly utopian to think this could be done all

at once. It would be so utopian that in practice it would only postpone socialism to kingdom come.

No, that is not the way we intend to build socialism. We are building while still standing on the soil of capitalist society, combating all those weaknesses and shortcomings which also affect the working people and which tend to drag the proletariat down. There are many old separatist habits and customs of the small holder in this struggle, and we still feel the effects of the old maxim: "Every man for himself, and the devil take the hindmost." There used to be quite enough of that in every trade union, in every factory, which often thought only of itself, and left everything else to the tender care of the Lord and our betters. We have been through all that, and know the cost. It has been the cause of so many mistakes, so many dreadful mistakes, that now, on the strength of that experience, we give our comrades a most emphatic warning against any arbitrary action in this field. Instead of building socialism, it would mean we had all succumbed to the weaknesses of capitalism.

We have now learnt to appreciate the difficulties of the task in front of us. We stand at the very heart of the work of building socialism, and in the interests of this cardinal work we are against all arbitrary actions. The class-conscious workers must be warned against arbitrary actions of this kind. They must be told that we cannot merge the trade unions with the state bodies at once, at one stroke. It would be a mistake. That is not the way to tackle the job.

We know that the proletariat has promoted several thousands, perhaps several tens of thousands of workers to state administration. We know that the new class—the proletariat—now has its representatives in every branch of state administration, in every section of the enterprises already socialised or about to be socialised, and in every branch of the economy. The proletariat knows this. It has set about the job practically. It can now see that we must continue along the same lines, that we shall have to take quite a number of steps more before we are in a position to say that the trade union organisations of the working people have definitely merged with the entire state

apparatus. That will be so when the workers completely take over the organs of suppression of one class over the other. And we are quite certain that will be so.

I now want to focus your attention on the next practical job. We must go on extending the participation of the working people in economic administration and in building a new economy. We shall never bring the work of communist construction to its completion unless we cope with this task, unless we convert the trade unions into organs for training ten times as many people as at present for direct participation in state administration. That we realise quite clearly. It is dealt with in our resolution, and it is a matter I want to direct your attention to particularly.

In this greatest revolution in history, when the proletariat has taken state power into its own hands, all the functions of the trade unions are undergoing a profound change. The trade unions are becoming the chief builders of the new society, for only the millions can build this society. In the era of serfdom these builders numbered hundreds; in the capitalist era the builders of the state numbered thousands and tens of thousands. The socialist revolution can be made only with the active and direct practical participation of tens of millions in state administration. That is our goal but we are not there yet.

The trade unions should know that there is a higher and more important task than those tasks which are partly still in force and partly have already lapsed, and which, at any rate, even if they are still in force, can only be minor ones in our eyes: registration, establishing work standards, amalgamation of organisations. This task is to teach the people the art of administration, not from books, not from lectures or meetings, but from practical experience, so that instead of just the vanguard of the proletariat which has been set to command and organise, more and more fresh blood may enter the departments, and this new section may be reinforced by ten others like it. This may seem an immense and difficult task. But it will not seem so overpowering if we stop to think how rapidly the experience of the revolution has enabled us to cope with the immense tasks that have cropped up since the October Revolution,

and how the working people who had had no access to and no use for knowledge are now thirsting for it.

We shall find that we can cope with this task and teach vast numbers of working people how to run the state and industry. We shall discover we can develop practical activity, and shatter that pernicious prejudice which for decades and centuries has been implanted among the working people, namely, that state administration is the preserve of the privileged few, that it is a special art. That is not true. We shall inevitably make mistakes; but now every mistake will serve to teach, not handfuls of students taking some course of theory in state administration, but millions of working people who will personally suffer the consequences of every mistake. They will themselves see that they are faced with the urgent task of registering and distributing products, of increasing labour productivity, and will see from experience that power is in their own hands and that nobody will help them if they do not help themselves. That is the new mentality which is awakening in the working class. That is the new task of tremendous historical importance which faces the proletariat and which must, more than any other, strike root in the minds of trade unionists and the leaders of the trade union movement. They are not only trade unions. Today they are trade unions only to the extent that they are constituted within the only possible framework linked with the old capitalist system, and embrace the largest number of working people. But their task is to advance these millions and tens of millions of working people from simple to higher forms of activity, untiringly drawing new forces from the reserve of working people and advancing them to the most difficult tasks. In this way they will teach more and more people the art of state administration. It is their job to identify themselves with the struggle of the proletariat, which has established the dictatorship and is retaining it in the face of the whole world, every day winning over more industrial workers and socialists everywhere who only yesterday tolerated the orders of the social-traitors and social-defence advocates, but who are today coming more and more to accept the banner of communism and the Communist International.

Hold on to this banner, and at the same time steadily enlarge the ranks of the builders of socialism. Remember that the tasks of the trade unions are to build the new life and train millions and tens of millions, who will learn by experience not to make mistakes and will discard the old prejudices, who will learn by their own experience how to run the state and industry. That is the only sure guarantee that the cause of socialism will completely triumph, precluding any chance of a reversion to the past.

Newspaper reports published
January 21, 1919 in
Ekonomscheskaya Zhizn No. 14
and in *Pravda* Nos. 15, 16, 17
for January 22, 24, 25

Published according to the
book checked with the
verbatim report and
the newspaper texts

LETTER TO THE WORKERS OF EUROPE AND AMERICA¹²

Comrades, at the end of my letter to American workers dated August 20, 1918, I wrote that we are in a besieged fortress so long as the other armies of the world socialist revolution do not come to our aid. I added that the workers are breaking away from their social-traitors, the Gomperses and Renners. The workers are slowly but surely coming round to communist and Bolshevik tactics.

Less than five months have passed since those words were written, and it must be said that during this time, in view of the fact that workers of various countries have turned to communism and Bolshevism, the maturing of the world proletarian revolution has proceeded very rapidly.

Then, on August 20, 1918, only our Party, the Bolshevik Party, had resolutely broken with the old, Second International of 1889-1914 which so shamefully collapsed during the imperialist war of 1914-18. Only our Party had unreservedly taken the new path, from the socialists and social-democracy which had disgraced themselves by alliance with the predatory bourgeoisie, to communism; from petty-bourgeois reformism and opportunism, which had thoroughly permeated, and now permeate, the official Social-Democratic and socialist parties, to genuinely proletarian, revolutionary tactics.

Now, on January 12, 1919, we already see quite a number of communist proletarian parties, not only within the boundaries of the former tsarist empire—in Latvia, Finland and Poland, for example—but also in Western Europe—Austria, Hungary, Holland and, lastly, Germany. The *foundation* of a genuinely proletarian, genuinely interna-

tionalist, genuinely revolutionary Third International, the *Communist International*, became a *fact* when the German Spartacus League, with such world-known and world-famous leaders, with such staunch working-class champions as Liebknecht, Rosa Luxemburg, Clara Zetkin and Franz Mehring, made a clean break with socialists like Scheidemann and Südekum, social-chauvinists (socialists in words, but chauvinists in deeds) who have earned eternal shame by their alliance with the predatory, imperialist German bourgeoisie and Wilhelm II. It became a fact when the Spartacus League changed its name to the Communist Party of Germany. Though it has not yet been officially inaugurated, the Third International actually exists.

No class-conscious worker, no sincere socialist can now fail to see how dastardly was the betrayal of socialism by those who, like the Mensheviks and "Socialist-Revolutionaries" in Russia, the Scheidemanns and Südekums in Germany, the Renaudels and Vanderveldes in France, the Hendersons and Webbs in Britain, and Gompers and Co. in America, supported "their" bourgeoisie in the 1914-18 war. That war fully exposed itself as an imperialist, reactionary, predatory war both on the part of Germany and on the part of the capitalists of Britain, France, Italy and America. The latter are now beginning to quarrel over the spoils, over the division of Turkey, Russia, the African and Polynesian colonies, the Balkans, and so on. The hypocritical phrases uttered by Wilson and his followers about "democracy" and "union of nations" are exposed with amazing rapidity when we see the capture of the left bank of the Rhine by the French bourgeoisie, the capture of Turkey (Syria, Mesopotamia) and part of Russia (Siberia, Archangel, Baku, Krasnovodsk, Ashkhabad, and so on) by the French, British and American capitalists, and the increasing animosity over the division of the spoils between Italy and France, France and Britain, Britain and America, America and Japan.

Beside the craven, half-hearted "socialists" who are thoroughly imbued with the prejudices of bourgeois democracy, who yesterday defended "their" imperialist governments and today limit themselves to platonic "protests" against military intervention in Russia—beside

these there is a growing number of people in the Allied countries who have taken the communist path, the path of Maclean, Debs, Loriot, Lazzari and Serrati. These are men who have realised that if imperialism is to be crushed and the victory of socialism and lasting peace ensured, the bourgeoisie must be overthrown, bourgeois parliaments abolished, and Soviet power and the dictatorship of the proletariat established.

Then, on August 20, 1918, the proletarian revolution was confined to Russia, and "Soviet government", i.e., the system under which *all* state power is vested in Soviets of Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Deputies, still seemed to be (and actually was) only a Russian institution.

Now, on January 12, 1919, we see a mighty "Soviet" movement not only in parts of the former tsarist empire, for example, in Latvia, Poland and the Ukraine, but also in West-European countries, in neutral countries (Switzerland, Holland and Norway) and in countries which have suffered from the war (Austria and Germany). The revolution in Germany—which is particularly important and characteristic as one of the most advanced capitalist countries—at once assumed "Soviet" forms. The whole course of the German revolution, and particularly the struggle of the Spartacists, i.e., the true and only representatives of the proletariat, against the alliance of those treacherous scoundrels, the Scheidemanns and Südekums, with the bourgeoisie—all this clearly shows how history has *formulated* the question in relation to Germany:

"Soviet power" or the bourgeois parliament, no matter under what signboard (such as "National" or "Constituent" Assembly) it may appear.

That is how *world history* has formulated the question. Now, this can and must be said without any exaggeration.

"Soviet power" is the second historical step, or stage, in the development of the proletarian dictatorship. The first step was the Paris Commune. The brilliant analysis of its nature and significance given by Marx in his *The Civil War in France* showed that the Commune had created a *new type* of state, a *proletarian state*. Every state, including the most democratic republic, is nothing but a machine for the suppression of one class by another. The proletarian

state is a machine for the suppression of the bourgeoisie by the proletariat. Such suppression is necessary because of the furious, desperate resistance put up by the land-owners and capitalists, by the entire bourgeoisie and all their hangers-on, by all the exploiters, who stop at nothing when their overthrow, when the expropriation of the expropriators, begins.

The bourgeois parliament, even the most democratic in the most democratic republic, in which the property and rule of the capitalists are preserved, is a machine for the suppression of the working millions by small groups of exploiters. The socialists, the fighters for the emancipation of the working people from exploitation, had to utilise the bourgeois parliaments as a platform, as a base, for propaganda, agitation and organisation *as long as our struggle was confined to the framework of the bourgeois system*. Now that world history has brought up the question of destroying the whole of that system, of overthrowing and suppressing the exploiters, of passing from capitalism to socialism, it would be a shameful betrayal of the proletariat, deserting to its class enemy, the bourgeoisie, and being a traitor and a renegade to confine oneself to bourgeois parliamentarism, to bourgeois democracy, to present it as "democracy" in general, to obscure its *bourgeois* character, to forget that as long as capitalist property exists universal suffrage is an instrument of the bourgeois state.

The three trends in world socialism, about which the Bolshevik press has been speaking incessantly since 1915, stand out with particular distinctness today, against the background of the bloody struggle and civil war in Germany.

Karl Liebknecht is a name known to the workers of all countries. Everywhere, and particularly in the Allied countries, it is the symbol of a leader's devotion to the interests of the proletariat and loyalty to the socialist revolution. It is the symbol of really sincere, really self-sacrificing and ruthless struggle against capitalism. It is the symbol of uncompromising struggle against imperialism not in words, but in deeds, of self-sacrificing struggle precisely in the period when "one's own" country is flushed with imperialist victories. With Liebknecht and the Spartacists are all those German socialists who have remained

honest and really revolutionary, all the best and dedicated men among the proletariat, the exploited masses who are seething with indignation and among whom there is a growing readiness for revolution.

Against Liebknecht are the Scheidemanns, the Südekums and the whole gang of despicable lackeys of the Kaiser and the bourgeoisie. They are just as much traitors to socialism as the Gomperses and Victor Bergers, the Hendersons and Webbs, the Renaudels and Vanderveldes. They represent that top section of workers who have been bribed by the bourgeoisie, those whom we Bolsheviks called (applying the name to the Russian Südekums, the Mensheviks) "agents of the bourgeoisie in the working-class movement", and to whom the best socialists in America gave the magnificently expressive and very fitting title: "labour lieutenants of the capitalist class". They represent *the latest*, "modern", *type* of socialist treachery, for in all the civilised, advanced countries the bourgeoisie rob—either by colonial oppression or by financially extracting "gain" from formally independent weak countries—they rob a population many times larger than that of "their own" country. This is the economic factor that enables the imperialist bourgeoisie to obtain superprofits, part of which is used to bribe the top section of the proletariat and convert it into a reformist, opportunist petty bourgeoisie that fears revolution.

Between the Spartacists and the Scheidemann men are the wavering, spineless "Kautskyites", who in words are "independent", but in deeds are entirely, and all along the line, *dependent* upon the bourgeoisie and the Scheidemann men one day, upon the Spartacists the next, some following the former and some the latter. These are people without ideas, without backbone, without policy, without honour, without conscience, the living embodiment of the bewilderment of philistines who stand for socialist revolution in words, but are actually incapable of understanding it when it has begun and, in renegade fashion, defend "democracy" in general, that is, *actually* defend *bourgeois* democracy.

In every capitalist country, every thinking worker will, in the situation varying with national and historical conditions, perceive these three main trends among the

socialists and among the syndicalists, for the imperialist war and the incipient world proletarian revolution engender identical ideological and political trends all over the world.

* * *

The foregoing lines were written before the brutal and dastardly murder of Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg by the Ebert and Scheidemann government. Those butchers, in their servility to the bourgeoisie, allowed the German whiteguards, the watchdogs of sacred capitalist property, to lynch Rosa Luxemburg, to murder Karl Liebknecht by shooting him in the back on the patently false plea that he "attempted to escape" (Russian tsarism often used that excuse to murder prisoners during its bloody suppression of the 1905 Revolution). At the same time those butchers protected the whiteguards with the authority of the government, which claims to be quite innocent and to stand above classes! No words can describe the foul and abominable character of the butchery perpetrated by alleged socialists. Evidently, history has chosen a path on which the role of "labour lieutenants of the capitalist class" must be played to the "last degree" of brutality, baseness and meanness. Let those simpletons, the Kautskyites, talk in their newspaper *Freiheit*¹⁶³ about a "court" of representatives of "all" "socialist" parties (those servile souls insist that the Scheidemann executioners are socialists)! Those heroes of philistine stupidity and petty-bourgeois cowardice even fail to understand that the courts are organs of state power, and that the issue in the struggle and civil war now being waged in Germany is precisely one of who is to hold this power—the bourgeoisie, "served" by the Scheidemanns as executioners and instigators of pogroms, and by the Kautskys as glorifiers of "pure democracy", or the proletariat, which will overthrow the capitalist exploiters and crush their resistance.

The blood of the best representatives of the world proletarian International, of the unforgettable leaders of the world socialist revolution, will steel ever new masses of workers for the life-and-death struggle. And this struggle will lead to victory. We in Russia, in the summer of 1917,

lived through the "July days",¹⁶⁴ when the Russian Scheidemanns, the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries, also provided "state" protection for the "victory" of the whiteguards over the Bolsheviks, and when Cossacks shot the worker Voinov in the streets of Petrograd for distributing Bolshevik leaflets.¹⁶⁵ We know from experience how quickly such "victories" of the bourgeoisie and their henchmen cure the people of their illusions about bourgeois democracy, "universal suffrage", and so forth.

* * *

The bourgeoisie and the governments of the Allied countries seem to be wavering. One section sees that demoralisation is already setting in among the Allied troops in Russia, who are helping the whiteguards and serving the blackest monarchist and landlord reaction. It realises that continuation of the military intervention and attempts to defeat Russia—which would mean maintaining a million-strong army of occupation for a long time—is the surest and quickest way of carrying the proletarian revolution to the Allied countries. The example of the German occupation forces in the Ukraine is convincing enough of that.

Another section of the Allied bourgeoisie persists in its policy of military intervention, "economic encirclement" (Clemenceau) and strangulation of the Soviet Republic. The entire press in the service of that bourgeoisie, i.e., the majority of the capitalist-bought daily newspapers in Britain and France, predicts the early collapse of the Soviet government, draws lurid pictures of the horrors of the famine in Russia, lies about "disorders" and the "instability" of the Soviet Government. The whiteguard armies of the landowners and capitalists, whom the Allies are helping with officers, ammunition, money and auxiliary detachments, are cutting off the starving central and northern parts of Russia from the most fertile regions, Siberia and the Don.

The distress of the starving workers in Petrograd and Moscow, in Ivanovo-Voznesensk and other industrial centres is indeed great. If the workers did not understand that they are defending the cause of socialism in Russia and

throughout the world they would never be able to bear the hardships, the torments of hunger to which they are doomed by the Allied military intervention (often covered up by hypocritical promises not to send their "own" troops, while continuing to send "black" troops, and also ammunition, money and officers).

The "Allied" and whiteguard troops hold Archangel, Perm, Orenburg, Rostov-on-Don, Baku and Ashkhabad, but the "Soviet movement" has won Riga and Kharkov. Latvia and the Ukraine are becoming Soviet republics. The workers see that their great sacrifices are not in vain, that the victory of Soviet power is approaching, spreading, growing and gaining strength the world over. Every month of hard fighting and heavy sacrifice strengthens the cause of Soviet power throughout the world and weakens its enemies, the exploiters.

The exploiters are still strong enough to murder the finest leaders of the world proletarian revolution, to increase the sacrifices and suffering of the workers in occupied or conquered countries and regions. But the exploiters all over the world are not strong enough to prevent the victory of the world proletarian revolution, which will free mankind from the yoke of capital and the eternal menace of new imperialist wars, which are inevitable under capitalism.

N. Lenin

January 21, 1919

Pravda No. 16,
January 24, 1919

Published according to
the manuscript

**SPEECH AT THE SECOND CONFERENCE OF HEADS OF
ADULT EDUCATION DIVISIONS OF GUBERNIA .
EDUCATION DEPARTMENTS
JANUARY 24, 1919**

Comrades, you are all here as representatives of local adult education departments of gubernia Soviets. I have not got a lot to say since, unfortunately, I am not very closely acquainted with your work. Greetings to your congress of adult educationalists—you certainly have some important tasks to fulfil!

There are many schoolteachers in our schools trained in the old ways and this makes things difficult to change over from the capitalist to the socialist system. Although it may seem strange, many learned people are putting up stubborn resistance to us. Those who are used to looking on the old apparatus as their own private domain, merely look after themselves and serve the propertied class.

Adult education is better off than children's school education.

We recently discussed the question in the Council of People's Commissars of setting up a commission for amalgamating several scattered educational organisations. Adult education is important for transforming the whole of our life. New ways have to be sought.

It must be admitted that some new and inexperienced representatives of the Soviet government frequently use the old methods and give the government a bad name.

I think you adult educationalists have a hard job on your hands. In our Party work we have set our own ways of far-reaching influence on the masses, but they must be linked up with educational methods, and particularly with

school and, above all, adult education. This is not always done.

In your adult education work you get assistance from the working people in the sense that they thirst for knowledge and this makes it easier for you to get across to them. This is the last place you can gallop ahead, especially with masses at a very low level of education. You must try to work more closely with Party organisations, as propaganda organs, and get the masses into the adult education campaign. If the popular initiative meets the necessary response from you, you can expect the best results. Allow me to wish you the best of luck.

Adult Education No. 2-3,
February-March 1919

Published according to
the journal *Adult Education*

EVERYBODY ON FOOD AND TRANSPORT WORK!

I have already had occasion at the last session of the Central Executive Committee to point out that the next six months will be particularly difficult for the Soviet Republic. During the first six months of 1918 we procured 28,000,000 poods of grain, and during the second 67,000,000 poods. The first six months of 1919 will be more difficult than the preceding.

The food shortage is growing more and more acute. Typhus is becoming an extremely serious menace. Heroic efforts are required, but what we are doing is far from enough.

Can we save the situation?

Certainly. The capture of Ufa and Orenburg, our victories in the South and the success of the Soviet uprising in the Ukraine¹⁶⁶ open up very favourable prospects.

We are now in a position to procure far more grain than is required for semi-starvation food rations.

Millions of poods of grain have already been delivered in the East. They are being held up by the bad state of the transport system. In the South, the liberation of the entire Voronezh Gubernia and part of the Don region from Krasnov's Cossacks makes it fully possible to procure considerable quantities of grain, over and above our previous calculations. Finally, the grain surplus in the Ukraine is truly enormous, and the Soviet Government of the Ukraine is offering to help us.

Not only can we now obviate famine, but we can even fully satisfy the starving population of non-agricultural Russia.

The whole trouble lies in the bad state of transport and the tremendous shortage of food workers.

Every effort must be made and we must stir the mass of workers into action. We must definitely get out of the habitual, everyday rut of life and work. We must pull ourselves together. We must set about the *revolutionary mobilisation* of people for food and transport work. We must not confine ourselves to "current" work, but go beyond its bounds and discover new methods of securing additional forces.

On the most "cautious" and even pessimistic estimate, we now have very weighty grounds for believing that a victory over famine and typhus in these six months (and such a victory is *perfectly feasible*) will lead to a *radical improvement* in the whole economic situation, for the establishment of contact with the Ukraine and Tashkent removes the main and basic causes of the shortage and dearth of raw materials.

Of course, the hungry masses are exhausted, and that exhaustion is at times more than human strength can endure. But there is a way out, and renewed energy is undoubtedly possible, all the more since the growth of the proletarian revolution all over the world is becoming increasingly apparent and promises a radical improvement in our foreign as well as our home affairs.

We must pull ourselves together.

Every Party organisation, every trade union, every group of organised workers, and even workers who are not organised but are anxious to "tackle" the famine—every group of Soviet workers and citizens generally must ask themselves the following questions:

What can we do to extend and intensify the national crusade against the famine?

Can we replace male labour by female labour and thus release more men for the difficult duties of transport and food work?

Can we provide commissars for the engine and carriage repair shops?

Can we provide rank-and-file workers for the food army?

Should we not assign every tenth or fifth man from our midst, from our group, from our factory, etc., to the food

army, or for exceptionally difficult and arduous work in the railway shops?

Are not some of us engaged in Soviet or other work which might be relaxed or even suspended altogether without undermining the main foundations of the state? Is it not our duty to mobilise such workers immediately for food and transport work?

Let as many people as possible go into action and deal one more blow to that accursed maxim of the old capitalist society, a maxim which we have inherited from that society and which infects and spoils every one of us in one degree or another, the maxim "every man for himself, and the devil take the hindmost". It is this heritage from predatory, sordid and bloody capitalism that is stifling us, crushing us, oppressing, ruining and frustrating us more than anything else. We cannot rid ourselves of this heritage at once. It must be fought incessantly; more than one crusade will have to be declared and conducted against it.

We can save the millions and tens of millions from famine and typhus. Salvation is at hand. The famine and typhus crisis hovering over us can be vanquished, and vanquished completely. It would be absurd, foolish, shameful to give way to despair. To stampede pellmell, every man for himself, and each as he knows best, just to "get out of the fix" oneself somehow, to shove back the more feeble and push forward alone, would be to desert, to abandon the sick and exhausted comrades and to make the overall situation even worse.

We have created the firm foundation of a Red Army, which has now *forced its way* through incredible difficulties, through the iron wall of the armies of the landowners and capitalists supported by the fabulously wealthy British and French multimillionaires, forced its way through to the principal sources of raw materials, to grain, cotton and coal. We created that foundation by working in a new way, by political propaganda at the front, by organising the Communists of our army, by the self-sacrificing organisation and struggle of the best of the workers.

We have gained a number of successes both on the external, military front and on the home front, in the fight against the exploiters, against sabotage, and for the dif-

ficult, arduous, thorny but *correct* path of socialist construction. We are on the verge of a complete and decisive victory both at home and on an international scale.

A little more effort, and we shall escape from the tenacious clutches of famine.

What we have done and are doing for the Red Army we must also do, and with redoubled energies, to step up, extend and intensify food and transport work. All our best workers must do *this* work. A place will be found for everybody who is anxious and able to work. Everybody who wishes can help to achieve an organised and mass victory over devastation and famine. Every active force, every talent, every speciality, every trade, every thoughtful individual can and must be found employment in this *peace army* of food and transport workers—a peace army which, to achieve complete victory, must now support the Red Army and consolidate and follow up its victories.

Everybody on food and transport work!

N. Lenin

January 26, 1919

Pravda No. 19,
January 28, 1919

Published according to
the manuscript

**MEASURES GOVERNING THE TRANSITION FROM
BOURGEOIS-CO-OPERATIVE TO PROLETARIAN-
COMMUNIST
SUPPLY AND DISTRIBUTION¹⁰⁷**

The question of the co-operatives and consumers' communes (see *Izvestia*, February 2) recently discussed in the Council of People's Commissars involves the *most vital* problem of the day, measures of *transition from the bourgeois co-operatives to a communist consumers' and producers' union of the whole population*.

Let us imagine co-operatives embrace 98 per cent of the population. This happens in the countryside.

Does this make them communes?

No, if the co-operative (1) gives advantages (dividends on shares, etc.) to a group of special shareholders; (2) preserves its own special apparatus which shuts out the population at large, in particular the proletariat and semi-proletariat; (3) does not give preference in produce distribution to the semi-proletariat over the middle peasants, to the middle peasants over the rich; (4) does not confiscate the surplus produce first from the rich, then from the middle peasants, and does not rely on the proletariat and semi-proletariat. And so on and so forth.

The whole difficulty of the task (and the whole *essence* of the present task which confronts us right now) springs from the fact that we have to work out a system of *practical* measures governing the *transition* from the old co-operatives (which are bound to be bourgeois since they have a group of *shareholders* who constitute a *minority* of the population, as well as for other reasons) to a new and

to a real *commune*. These are measures for the transition from bourgeois-co-operative to proletarian-communist supply and distribution.

It is essential

- (1) to discuss this question in the press;
- (2) to organise the movement of all the central and local government institutions (particularly of the Supreme Economic Council and the other Economic Councils, the Food Commissariat and food departments, the Central Statistical Board and the People's Commissariat of Agriculture) to tackle this task;
- (3) to instruct the Co-operative Department of the Supreme Economic Council and the institutions enumerated in par. 2 to work out a *programme* of these measures and a form for collecting information on such measures and facts which enable us to develop these measures;
- (4) to award a bonus for the best programme of measures, for the most practicable programme, for the most convenient and effective form and means of collecting information about it.

Written February 2, 1919

Published according to
the manuscript

**TELEGRAM TO UFA GUBERNIA REVOLUTIONARY
COMMITTEE¹⁶⁸**

Ufa, Gubernia Revolutionary Committee Chairman

Propose not to alienate Khalikov and to grant amnesty on condition that a common front with Bashkir regiments is set up against Kolchak. The Soviet government pledges its full guarantee for Bashkir national freedom. But naturally, you must deal severely with counter-revolutionaries among Bashkir population and achieve *de facto* control to ensure proletarian reliability of Bashkir forces.

Lenin, Stalin

Written February 5 or 6, 1919

Published February 16, 1919
in *Zhizn Natsionalnosti*
No. 5 (13)

Published according to
the manuscript

**DRAFT WIRELESS MESSAGE FROM
PEOPLE'S COMMISSAR FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS¹⁶⁰**

In reply to your wireless message I hasten to inform you that although we do not consider the Berne Conference either socialist or in any way representative of the working class, we nevertheless permit the commission appointed by you to come to Russia and guarantee it the opportunity to fully acquaint itself with the situation, just as we permit the entry of any bourgeois commission on a fact-finding mission, directly or indirectly connected with any bourgeois government, even if it is engaged in attacking the Soviet Republic. Permitting the entry of your commission we would like to know whether your democratic government, and the governments of other democratic countries, whose citizens take part in the commission, will permit the entry of our commission from the Soviet Republic.

Written February 19, 1919

Published February 20, 1919
in *Izvestia* No. 39

Published according to
the manuscript

CLOSURE OF THE MENSHEVIK NEWSPAPER UNDERMINING THE COUNTRY'S DEFENCE

ALL-RUSSIA CENTRAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE DRAFT
RESOLUTION¹⁷⁰

Taking into consideration that

- 1) the Menshevik newspaper *Vsegda Vpered* published an article "Stop the Civil War" on 20.2.19, which proved once and for all that it is counter-revolutionary;
- 2) the slogan "Down with the Civil War", openly advocated in the paper at a time when the landlord and capitalist troops, led by Kolchak, have captured Perm as well as Siberia, is equivalent to support for Kolchak and an obstacle to the workers and peasants of Russia winning the war against Kolchak;
- 3) the Mensheviks, who in their conference resolution condemned the overwhelming majority of Menshevik party members who have lined up with the propertied classes, i.e., the landowners and capitalists in Siberia, Archangel, on the Volga, in Georgia and the South, are thus now starting to pursue the same policy in fact, while hypocritically denying it in words;
- 4) those of the Mensheviks who are not hypocritical friends of the landowners and capitalists are now again displaying the spineless vacillation bringing them to serving Kolchak;
- 5) the Soviet Government, right at the time of the last, decisive and sharpest armed clash with the landlord and capitalist troops, cannot put up with people who are unwilling to endure great sacrifices alongside the workers and peasants fighting for their just cause;

6) such people are again and again leaning towards the Kolchak brand of democracy under which the bourgeoisie and their hangers-on do so well,

the Central Executive Committee decrees that

a) the newspaper *Vsegda Vpered* shall be closed down until the Mensheviks show by actions their resolve to break once and for all with Kolchak and firmly stand for the defence and support of the Soviet government;

b) all the necessary measures shall be taken to exile Mensheviks hampering the victory of the workers and peasants over Kolchak to a life under the Kolchak brand of democracy.

Written February 22, 1919

Published according to
the manuscript

Прочитал передают в Библиотеке Академии наук (на
Больш. ул., 19, в зале). С. С. - 37.) известий оно до-
записанное автографом но Борису, на одном оди-
норечии в СССР, " составлять и важные (одн. 38-
го) записи о своем изобретении.

Дистрофия соли, бактериоза, кониаз, "зуб-зубчик"; бледная гипотония "7", болезнь Барта Бирбюлова сопряженная с нарушением функций кишечника, желудка, печени и т. д.

Она заслужила заслуженное рекомендованное по-
лучение золотой премии на выставке, организованной
Министерством культуры и культуры в Москве.

First page of the manuscript
"To the People's Commissariat of Education". February 1919
Reduced

TO THE PEOPLE'S COMMISSARIAT OF EDUCATION"

Please pass on to your library departments (both adult education and public library, etc.) my supplementary ideas on the question recently raised in the Council of People's Commissars and let me know your conclusions (and those of the respective departments).

* * *

More than anything else the libraries, including of course reading huts, all kinds of reading rooms, etc., require *competition* between individual provincial libraries, groups, reading rooms, etc.

The proper way to *send in accounts*, which is now demanded by the Council of People's Commissars, should serve *three* aims:

- 1) authentic and complete *information* to the Soviet government and all citizens about what is going on;
- 2) enlisting the *public* in library work;
- 3) encouraging *competition* among library workers.

To these ends lists and forms of accounting should be immediately drawn up that will suit the purposes.

Account lists should, I think, be drawn up at the centre and then reprinted in the gubernias and distributed among all educational departments and *all* libraries, reading rooms, clubs, etc.

These account lists should *enumerate* (printed, say, in heavy type) the *compulsory* questions which library managers, etc., must answer on pain of *prosecution*. Apart from these compulsory questions there should be a *considerable* number of *non-compulsory* questions (in the sense that

failure to answer does not necessarily carry the threat of prosecution).

The compulsory questions should include the library's (or reading room's, etc.) address, name and address of the manager and his board members, quantity of books and newspapers, working hours, etc. (the big libraries will have to give more information).

The non-compulsory questions should include *all* improvements being applied in Switzerland and America (and elsewhere) so that we can *reward* (by giving bonuses in the form of valuable books, collections, and so on) those who make the most improvements and carry them out best of all.

For example: 1) Can you supply precise information to prove more books have been *lent* from your library? or 2) how many people visit your reading room? or 3) book and newspaper exchange with other libraries and reading rooms? or 4) compilation of a central catalogue? or 5) work on Sundays? or 6) work in the evenings? or 7) encouragement of new readers, women, children, non-Russians, etc.? or 8) satisfaction of readers' references? or 9) simple and practical means of storing books and newspapers? Saving them? Mechanical means of obtaining the book and returning it to its place? or 10) lending a book? or 11) simplification of guarantees in lending a book? or 12) sending it through the post?

And so on, ad infinitum....

Bonuses are to be awarded for the best accounts and forthcoming successes.

The Library Department of the People's Commissariat of Education *must* inform the Council of People's Commissioners about the *number* of accounts received monthly and the answers to which questions are given; and the totals.

Written in February 1919

Published according to
the manuscript

**FIRST CONGRESS
OF THE COMMUNIST
INTERNATIONAL¹⁷**

MARCH 2-6, 1919

1

SPEECH AT THE OPENING SESSION OF THE CONGRESS
MARCH 2

On behalf of the Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party I declare the First Congress of the Communist International open. First I would ask all present to rise in tribute to the finest representatives of the Third International: Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg. (*All rise.*)

Comrades, our gathering has great historic significance. It testifies to the collapse of all the illusions cherished by bourgeois democrats. Not only in Russia, but in the most developed capitalist countries of Europe, Germany for example, civil war is a fact.

The bourgeoisie are terror-stricken at the growing workers' revolutionary movement. This is understandable if we take into account that the development of events since the imperialist war inevitably favours the workers' revolutionary movement, and that the world revolution is beginning and growing in intensity everywhere.

The people are aware of the greatness and significance of the struggle now going on. All that is needed is to find the practical form to enable the proletariat to establish its rule. Such a form is the Soviet system with the dictatorship of the proletariat. Dictatorship of the proletariat—until now these words were Latin to the masses. Thanks to the spread of the Soviets throughout the world this Latin has been translated into all modern languages; a practical form of dictatorship has been found by the working people. The mass of workers now understand it thanks to Soviet power in Russia, thanks to the Spartacus League in Germany and to similar organisations in other countries,

such as, for example, the Shop Stewards Committees in Britain.¹⁷³ All this shows that a revolutionary form of the dictatorship of the proletariat has been found, that the proletariat is now able to exercise its rule.

Comrades, I think that after the events in Russia and the January struggle in Germany, it is especially important to note that in other countries, too, the latest form of the workers' movement is asserting itself and getting the upper hand. Today, for example, I read in an anti-socialist newspaper a report to the effect that the British Government had received a deputation from the Birmingham Workers' Council and had expressed its readiness to recognise the Councils as economic bodies.¹⁷⁴ The Soviet system has triumphed not only in backward Russia, but also in the most developed country of Europe—in Germany, and in Britain, the oldest capitalist country.

Even though the bourgeoisie are still raging, even though they may kill thousands more workers, victory will be ours, the victory of the world-wide communist revolution is assured.

Comrades, I extend hearty greetings to you on behalf of the Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party. I move that we elect a presidium. Let us have nominations.

Published according to the
Russian edition of the minutes
checked with the German
edition

2

THESES AND REPORT ON BOURGEOIS DEMOCRACY
AND THE DICTATORSHIP OF THE PROLETARIAT
MARCH 4

1. Faced with the growth of the revolutionary workers' movement in every country, the bourgeoisie and their agents in the workers' organisations are making desperate attempts to find ideological and political arguments in defence of the rule of the exploiters. Condemnation of dictatorship and defence of democracy are particularly prominent among these arguments. The falsity and hypocrisy of this argument, repeated in a thousand strains by the capitalist press and at the Berne yellow International Conference in February 1919, are obvious to all who refuse to betray the fundamental principles of socialism.

2. Firstly, this argument employs the concepts of "democracy in general" and "dictatorship in general", without posing the question of the class concerned. This non-class or above-class presentation, which supposedly is popular, is an outright travesty of the basic tenet of socialism, namely, its theory of class struggle, which socialists who have sided with the bourgeoisie recognise in words but disregard in practice. For in no civilised capitalist country does "democracy in general" exist; all that exists is bourgeois democracy, and it is not a question of "dictatorship in general", but of the dictatorship of the oppressed class, i.e., the proletariat, over its oppressors and exploiters, i.e., the bourgeoisie, in order to overcome the resistance offered by the exploiters in their fight to maintain their domination.

3. History teaches us that no oppressed class ever did, or could, achieve power without going through a period of dictatorship, i.e., the conquest of political power and forcible suppression of the resistance always offered by the exploiters—a resistance that is most desperate, most furious, and that stops at nothing. The bourgeoisie, whose domination is now defended by the socialists who denounce "dictatorship in general" and extol "democracy in general", won power in the advanced countries through a series of insurrections, civil wars, and the forcible suppression of kings, feudal lords, slaveowners and their attempts at restoration. In books, pamphlets, congress resolutions and propaganda speeches socialists everywhere have thousands and millions of times explained to the people the class nature of these bourgeois revolutions and this bourgeois dictatorship. That is why the present defence of bourgeois democracy under cover of talk about "democracy in general" and the present howls and shouts against proletarian dictatorship under cover of shouts about "dictatorship in general" are an outright betrayal of socialism. They are, in fact, desertion to the bourgeoisie, denial of the proletariat's right to its own, proletarian, revolution, and defence of bourgeois reformism at the very historical juncture when bourgeois reformism throughout the world has collapsed and the war has created a revolutionary situation.

4. In explaining the class nature of bourgeois civilisation, bourgeois democracy and the bourgeois parliamentary system, all socialists have expressed the idea formulated with the greatest scientific precision by Marx and Engels, namely, that the most democratic bourgeois republic is no more than a machine for the suppression of the working class by the bourgeoisie, for the suppression of the working people by a handful of capitalists.¹⁷⁵ There is not a single revolutionary, not a single Marxist among those now shouting against dictatorship and for democracy who has not sworn and vowed to the workers that he accepts this basic truth of socialism. But now, when the revolutionary proletariat is in a fighting mood and taking action to destroy this machine of oppression and to establish proletarian dictatorship, these traitors to socialism claim that

the bourgeoisie have granted the working people "pure democracy", have abandoned resistance and are prepared to yield to the majority of the working people. They assert that in a democratic republic there is not, and never has been, any such thing as a state machine for the oppression of labour by capital.

5. The Paris Commune—to which all who parade as socialists pay lip service, for they know that the workers ardently and sincerely sympathise with the Commune—showed very clearly the historically conventional nature and limited value of the bourgeois parliamentary system and bourgeois democracy—stitutions which, though highly progressive compared with medieval times, inevitably require a radical alteration in the era of proletarian revolution. It was Marx who best appraised the historical significance of the Commune. In his analysis, he revealed the exploiting nature of bourgeois democracy and the bourgeois parliamentary system under which the oppressed classes enjoy the right to decide once in several years which representative of the propertied classes shall "represent and suppress" (*ver- und zertreten*) the people in parliament.¹⁷⁸ And it is now, when the Soviet movement is embracing the entire world and continuing the work of the Commune for all to see, that the traitors to socialism are forgetting the concrete experience and concrete lessons of the Paris Commune and repeating the old bourgeois rubbish about "democracy in general". The Commune was not a parliamentary institution.

6. The significance of the Commune, furthermore, lies in the fact that it endeavoured to crush, to smash to its very foundations, the bourgeois state apparatus, the bureaucratic, judicial, military and police machine, and to replace it by a self-governing, mass workers' organisation in which there was no division between legislative and executive power. All contemporary bourgeois-democratic republics, including the German republic, which the traitors to socialism, in mockery of the truth, describe as a proletarian republic, retain this state apparatus. We therefore again get quite clear confirmation of the point that shouting in defence of "democracy in general" is actually defence of the bourgeoisie and their privileges as exploiters.

7. "Freedom of assembly" can be taken as a sample of the requisites of "pure democracy". Every class-conscious worker who has not broken with his class will readily appreciate the absurdity of promising freedom of assembly to the exploiters at a time and in a situation when the exploiters are resisting the overthrow of their rule and are fighting to retain their privileges. When the bourgeoisie were revolutionary, they did not, either in England in 1649 or in France in 1793, grant "freedom of assembly" to the monarchists and nobles, who summoned foreign troops and "assembled" to organise attempts at restoration. If the present-day bourgeoisie, who have long since become reactionary, demand from the proletariat advance guarantees of "freedom of assembly" for the exploiters, whatever the resistance offered by the capitalists to being expropriated, the workers will only laugh at their hypocrisy.

The workers know perfectly well, too, that even in the most democratic bourgeois republic "freedom of assembly" is a hollow phrase, for the rich have the best public and private buildings at their disposal, and enough leisure to assemble at meetings, which are protected by the bourgeois machine of power. The rural and urban workers and the small peasants—the overwhelming majority of the population—are denied all these things. As long as that state of affairs prevails, "equality", i.e., "pure democracy", is a fraud. The first thing to do to win genuine equality and enable the working people to enjoy democracy in practice is to deprive the exploiters of all the public and sumptuous private buildings, to give the working people leisure and to see to it that their freedom of assembly is protected by armed workers, not by scions of the nobility or capitalist officers in command of downtrodden soldiers.

Only when that change is effected can we speak of freedom of assembly and of equality without mocking at the workers, at working people in general, at the poor. And this change can be effected only by the vanguard of the working people, the proletariat, which overthrows the exploiters, the bourgeoisie.

8. "Freedom of the press" is another of the principal slogans of "pure democracy". And here, too, the workers know—and socialists everywhere have admitted it millions

of times—that this freedom is a deception while the best printing-presses and the biggest stocks of paper are appropriated by the capitalists, and while capitalist rule over the press remains, a rule that is manifested throughout the world all the more strikingly, sharply and cynically the more democracy and the republican system are developed, as in America for example. The first thing to do to win real equality and genuine democracy for the working people, for the workers and peasants, is to deprive capital of the possibility of hiring writers, buying up publishing houses and bribing newspapers. And to do that the capitalists and exploiters have to be overthrown and their resistance suppressed. The capitalists have always used the term "freedom" to mean freedom for the rich to get richer and for the workers to starve to death. In capitalist usage, freedom of the press means freedom of the rich to bribe the press, freedom to use their wealth to shape and fabricate so-called public opinion. In this respect, too, the defenders of "pure democracy" prove to be defenders of an utterly foul and venal system that gives the rich control over the mass media. They prove to be deceivers of the people, who, with the aid of plausible, fine-sounding, but thoroughly false phrases, divert them from the concrete historical task of liberating the press from capitalist enslavement. Genuine freedom and equality will be embodied in the system which the Communists are building, and in which there will be no opportunity for amassing wealth at the expense of others, no objective opportunities for putting the press under the direct or indirect power of money, and no impediments in the way of any workingman (or groups of workingmen, in any numbers) for enjoying and practising equal rights in the use of public printing-presses and public stocks of paper.

9. The history of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries demonstrated, even before the war, what this celebrated "pure democracy" really is under capitalism. Marxists have always maintained that the more developed, the "purer" democracy is, the more naked, acute and merciless the class struggle becomes, and the "purer" the capitalist oppression and bourgeois dictatorship. The Dreyfus case in republican France, the massacre of strikers by hired

bands armed by the capitalists in the free and democratic American republic—these and thousands of similar facts illustrate the truth which the bourgeoisie are vainly seeking to conceal, namely, that actually terror and bourgeois dictatorship prevail in the most democratic of republics and are openly displayed every time the exploiters think the power of capital is being shaken.

10. The imperialist war of 1914-18 conclusively revealed even to backward workers the true nature of bourgeois democracy, even in the freest republics, as being a dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. Tens of millions were killed for the sake of enriching the German or the British group of millionaires and multimillionaires, and bourgeois military dictatorships were established in the freest republics. This military dictatorship continues to exist in the Allied countries even after Germany's defeat. It was mostly the war that opened the eyes of the working people, that stripped bourgeois democracy of its camouflage and showed the people the abyss of speculation and profiteering that existed during and because of the war. It was in the name of "freedom and equality" that the bourgeoisie waged the war, and in the name of "freedom and equality" that the munition manufacturers piled up fabulous fortunes. Nothing that the yellow Berne International does can conceal from the people the now thoroughly exposed exploiting character of bourgeois freedom, bourgeois equality and bourgeois democracy.

11. In Germany, the most developed capitalist country of continental Europe, the very first months of full republican freedom, established as a result of imperialist Germany's defeat, have shown the German workers and the whole world the true class substance of the bourgeois-democratic republic. The murder of Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg is an event of epoch-making significance not only because of the tragic death of these finest people and leaders of the truly proletarian, Communist International, but also because the class nature of an advanced European state—it can be said without exaggeration, of an advanced state on a world-wide scale—has been conclusively exposed. If those arrested, i.e., those placed under state protection, could be assassinated by officers

and capitalists with impunity, and this under a government headed by social-patriots, then the democratic republic where such a thing was possible is a bourgeois dictatorship. Those who voice their indignation at the murder of Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg but fail to understand this fact are only demonstrating their stupidity, or hypocrisy. "Freedom" in the German republic, one of the freest and advanced republics of the world, is freedom to murder arrested leaders of the proletariat with impunity. Nor can it be otherwise as long as capitalism remains, for the development of democracy sharpens rather than dampens the class struggle which, by virtue of all the results and influences of the war and of its consequences, has been brought to boiling point.

Throughout the civilised world we see Bolsheviks being exiled, persecuted and thrown into prison. This is the case, for example, in Switzerland, one of the freest bourgeois republics, and in America, where there have been anti-Bolshevik pogroms, etc. From the standpoint of "democracy in general", or "pure democracy", it is really ridiculous that advanced, civilised, and democratic countries, which are armed to the teeth, should fear the presence of a few score men from backward, famine-stricken and ruined Russia, which the bourgeois papers, in tens of millions of copies, describe as savage, criminal, etc. Clearly, the social situation that could produce this crying contradiction is in fact a dictatorship of the bourgeoisie.

12. In these circumstances, proletarian dictatorship is not only an absolutely legitimate means of overthrowing the exploiters and suppressing their resistance, but also absolutely necessary to the entire mass of working people, being their only defence against the bourgeois dictatorship which led to the war and is preparing new wars.

The main thing that socialists fail to understand and that constitutes their short-sightedness in matters of theory, their subservience to bourgeois prejudices and their political betrayal of the proletariat is that in capitalist society, whenever there is any serious aggravation of the class struggle intrinsic to that society, there can be no alternative but the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie or the dictatorship of the proletariat. Dreams of some third way

are reactionary, petty-bourgeois lamentations. That is borne out by more than a century of development of bourgeois democracy and the working-class movement in all the advanced countries, and notably by the experience of the past five years. This is also borne out by the whole science of political economy, by the entire content of Marxism, which reveals the economic inevitability, wherever commodity economy prevails, of the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie that can only be replaced by the class which the very growth of capitalism develops, multiplies, welds together and strengthens, that is, the proletarian class.

13. Another theoretical and political error of the socialists is their failure to understand that ever since the rudiments of democracy first appeared in antiquity, its forms inevitably changed over the centuries as one ruling class replaced another. Democracy assumed different forms and was applied in different degrees in the ancient republics of Greece, the medieval cities and the advanced capitalist countries. It would be sheer nonsense to think that the most profound revolution in human history, the first case in the world of power being transferred from the exploiting minority to the exploited majority, could take place within the time-worn framework of the old, bourgeois, parliamentary democracy, without drastic changes, without the creation of new forms of democracy, new institutions that embody the new conditions for applying democracy, etc.

14. Proletarian dictatorship is similar to the dictatorship of other classes in that it arises out of the need, as every other dictatorship does, to forcibly suppress the resistance of the class that is losing its political sway. The fundamental distinction between the dictatorship of the proletariat and the dictatorship of other classes—landlord dictatorship in the Middle Ages and bourgeois dictatorship in all the civilised capitalist countries—consists in the fact that the dictatorship of the landowners and bourgeoisie was the forcible suppression of the resistance offered by the vast majority of the population, namely, the working people. In contrast, proletarian dictatorship is the forcible suppression of the resistance of the exploiters, i.e., an insignificant minority of the population, the landowners and capitalists.

It follows that proletarian dictatorship must inevitably entail not only a change in democratic forms and institutions, generally speaking, but precisely such a change as provides an unparalleled extension of the actual enjoyment of democracy by those oppressed by capitalism—the toiling classes.

And indeed, the form of proletarian dictatorship that has already taken shape, i.e., Soviet power in Russia, the Räte-System in Germany, the Shop Stewards Committees in Britain and similar Soviet institutions in other countries, all this implies and presents to the toiling classes, i.e., the vast majority of the population, greater practical opportunities for enjoying democratic rights and liberties than ever existed before, even approximately, in the best and the most democratic bourgeois republics.

The substance of Soviet government is that the permanent and only foundation of state power, the entire machinery of state, is the mass-scale organisation of the classes oppressed by capitalism, i.e., the workers and the semi-proletarians (peasants who do not exploit the labour of others and regularly resort to the sale of at least a part of their own labour-power). It is the people, who even in the most democratic bourgeois republics, while possessing equal rights by law, have in fact been debarred by thousands of devices and subterfuges from participation in political life and enjoyment of democratic rights and liberties, that are now drawn into constant and unfailing, moreover, decisive, participation in the democratic administration of the state.

15. The equality of citizens, irrespective of sex, religion, race, or nationality, which bourgeois democracy everywhere has always promised but never effected, and never could effect because of the domination of capital, is given immediate and full effect by the Soviet system, or dictatorship of the proletariat. The fact is that this can only be done by a government of the workers, who are not interested in the means of production being privately owned and in the fight for their division and redivision.

16. The old, i.e., bourgeois, democracy and the parliamentary system were so organised that it was the mass of working people who were kept farthest away from the

machinery of government. Soviet power, i. e., the dictatorship of the proletariat, on the other hand, is so organised as to bring the working people close to the machinery of government. That, too, is the purpose of combining the legislative and executive authority under the Soviet organisation of the state and of replacing territorial constituencies by production units—the factory.

17. The army was a machine of oppression not only under the monarchy. It remains as such in all bourgeois republics, even the most democratic ones. Only the Soviets, the permanent organisations of government authority of the classes that were oppressed by capitalism, are in a position to destroy the army's subordination to bourgeois commanders and really merge the proletariat with the army; only the Soviets can effectively arm the proletariat and disarm the bourgeoisie. Unless this is done, the victory of socialism is impossible.

18. The Soviet organisation of the state is suited to the leading role of the proletariat as a class most concentrated and enlightened by capitalism. The experience of all revolutions and all movements of the oppressed classes, the experience of the world socialist movement teaches us that only the proletariat is in a position to unite and lead the scattered and backward sections of the working and exploited population.

19. Only the Soviet organisation of the state can really effect the immediate break-up and total destruction of the old, i.e., bourgeois, bureaucratic and judicial machinery, which has been, and has inevitably had to be, retained under capitalism even in the most democratic republics, and which is, in actual fact, the greatest obstacle to the practical implementation of democracy for the workers and working people generally. The Paris Commune took the first epoch-making step along this path. The Soviet system has taken the second.

20. Destruction of state power is the aim set by all socialists, including Marx above all. Genuine democracy, i.e., liberty and equality, is unrealisable unless this aim is achieved. But its practical achievement is possible only through Soviet, or proletarian, democracy, for by enlisting the mass organisations of the working people in constant

and unfailing participation in the administration of the state, it immediately begins to prepare the complete withering away of any state.

21. The complete bankruptcy of the socialists who assembled in Berne, their complete failure to understand the new, i.e., proletarian, democracy, is especially apparent from the following. On February 10, 1919, Branting delivered the concluding speech at the international Conference of the yellow International in Berne. In Berlin, on February 11, 1919, *Die Freiheit*, the paper of the International's affiliates, published an appeal from the Party of "Independents" to the proletariat. The appeal acknowledged the bourgeois character of the Scheidemann government, rebuked it for wanting to abolish the Soviets, which it described as *Träger und Schützer der Revolution*—vehicles and guardians of the revolution—and proposed that the Soviets be legalised, invested with government authority and given the right to suspend the operation of National Assembly decisions pending a popular referendum.

That proposal indicates the complete ideological bankruptcy of the theorists who defended democracy and failed to see its bourgeois character. This ludicrous attempt to combine the Soviet system, i.e., proletarian dictatorship, with the National Assembly, i.e., bourgeois dictatorship, utterly exposes the paucity of thought of the yellow socialists and Social-Democrats, their reactionary petty-bourgeois political outlook, and their cowardly concessions to the irresistibly growing strength of the new, proletarian democracy.

22. From the class standpoint, the Berne yellow International majority, which did not dare to adopt a formal resolution out of fear of the mass of workers, was right in condemning Bolshevism. This majority is in full agreement with the Russian Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries, and the Scheidemanns in Germany. In complaining of persecution by the Bolsheviks, the Russian Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries try to conceal the fact that they are persecuted for participating in the Civil War on the side of the bourgeoisie against the proletariat. Similarly, the Scheidemanns and their party have already demonstrated in Germany that they, too, are participating in

the civil war on the side of the bourgeoisie against the workers.

It is therefore quite natural that the Berne yellow International majority should be in favour of condemning the Bolsheviks. This was not an expression of the defence of "pure democracy", but of the self-defence of people who know and feel that in the civil war they stand with the bourgeoisie against the proletariat.

That is why, from the class point of view, the decision of the yellow International majority must be considered correct. The proletariat must not fear the truth, it must face it squarely and draw all the necessary political conclusions.

Comrades, I would like to add a word or two to the last two points. I think that the comrades who are to report to us on the Berne Conference will deal with it in greater detail.

Not a word was said at the Berne Conference about the significance of Soviet power. We in Russia have been discussing this question for two years now. At our Party Conference in April 1917 we raised the following question, theoretically and politically: "What is Soviet power, what is its substance and what is its historical significance?" We have been discussing it for almost two years. And at our Party Congress we adopted a resolution on it.¹⁷⁷

On February 11 Berlin *Die Freiheit* published an appeal to the German proletariat signed not only by the leaders of the Independent Social-Democratic Party of Germany, but also by all the members of the Independent Social-Democratic group in the Reichstag. In August 1918, Kautsky, one of the leading theorists of these Independents, wrote a pamphlet entitled *The Dictatorship of the Proletariat*, in which he declared that he was a supporter of democracy and of Soviet bodies, but that the Soviets must be bodies merely of an economic character and that they must not by any means be recognised as state organisations. Kautsky says the same thing in *Die Freiheit* of November 11 and January 12. On February 9 an article appeared by Rudolf Hilferding, who is also regarded as one of the leading and authoritative theorists of the Second International, in which he proposed that the Soviet system be united with

the National Assembly juridically, by state legislation. That was on February 9. On February 11 this proposal was adopted by the whole of the Independent Party and published in the form of an appeal.

There is vacillation again, despite the fact that the National Assembly already exists, even after "pure democracy" has been embodied in reality, after the leading theorists of the Independent Social-Democratic Party have declared that the Soviet organisations must not be state organisations! This proves that these gentlemen really understand nothing about the new movement and about its conditions of struggle. But it goes to prove something else, namely, that there must be conditions, causes, for this vacillation! When, after all these events, after nearly two years of victorious revolution in Russia, we are offered resolutions like those adopted at the Berne Conference, which say nothing about the Soviets and their significance, about which not a single delegate uttered a single word, we have a perfect right to say that all these gentlemen are dead to us as socialists and theorists.

However, comrades, from the practical side, from the political point of view, the fact that these Independents, who in theory and on principle have been opposed to these state organisations, suddenly make the stupid proposal to "peacefully" unite the National Assembly with the Soviet system, i.e., to unite the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie with the dictatorship of the proletariat, shows that a great change is taking place among the masses. We see that the Independents are all bankrupt in the socialist and theoretical sense and that an enormous change is taking place among the masses. The backward masses among the German workers are coming to us, have come to us! So, the significance of the Independent Social-Democratic Party of Germany, the best section of the Berne Conference, is nil from the theoretical and socialist standpoint. Still, it has some significance, which is that these waverers serve as an index to us of the mood of the backward sections of the proletariat. This, in my opinion, is the great historical significance of this Conference. We experienced something of the kind in our own revolution. Our Mensheviks traversed almost exactly the same path as that of the theorists of

the Independents in Germany. At first, when they had a majority in the Soviets, they were in favour of the Soviets. All we heard then was: "Long live the Soviets!", "For the Soviets!", "The Soviets are revolutionary democracy!" When, however, we Bolsheviks secured a majority in the Soviets, they changed their tune; they said: the Soviets must not exist side by side with the Constituent Assembly. And various Menshevik theorists made practically the same proposals, like the one to unite the Soviet system with the Constituent Assembly and to incorporate the Soviets in the state structure. Once again it is here revealed that the general course of the proletarian revolution is the same throughout the world. First the spontaneous formation of Soviets, then their spread and development, and then the appearance of the practical problem: Soviets, or National Assembly, or Constituent Assembly, or the bourgeois parliamentary system; utter confusion among the leaders, and finally—the proletarian revolution. But I think we should not present the problem in this way after nearly two years of revolution; we should rather adopt concrete decisions because for us, and particularly for the majority of the West-European countries, spreading of the Soviet system is a most important task.

I would like to quote here just one Menshevik resolution. I asked Comrade Obolensky to translate it into German. He promised to do so but, unfortunately, he is not here. I shall try to render it from memory, as I have not the full text of it with me.

It is very difficult for a foreigner who has not heard anything about Bolshevism to arrive at an independent opinion about our controversial questions. Everything the Bolsheviks assert is challenged by the Mensheviks, and vice versa. Of course, it cannot be otherwise in the middle of a struggle, and that is why it is so important that the last Menshevik Party conference, held in December 1918, adopted the long and detailed resolution published in full in the Menshevik *Gazeta Pechatnikov*.¹⁷⁸ In this resolution the Mensheviks themselves briefly outline the history of the class struggle and of the Civil War. The resolution states that they condemn those groups in their party which are allied with the propertied classes in the

Urals, in the South, in the Crimea and in Georgia—all these regions are enumerated. Those groups of the Menshevik Party which, in alliance with the propertied classes, fought against the Soviets are now condemned in the resolution; but the last point of the resolution also condemns those who joined the Communists. It follows that the Mensheviks were compelled to admit that there was no unity in their party, and that its members were either on the side of the bourgeoisie or on the side of the proletariat. The majority of the Mensheviks went over to the bourgeoisie and fought against us during the Civil War. We, of course, persecute Mensheviks, we even shoot them, when they wage war against us, fight against our Red Army and shoot our Red commanders. We responded to the bourgeois war with the proletarian war—there can be no other way. Therefore, from the political point of view, all this is sheer Menshevik hypocrisy. Historically, it is incomprehensible how people who have not been officially certified as mad could talk at the Berne Conference, on the instructions of the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries, about the Bolsheviks fighting the latter, yet keep silent about their own struggle, in alliance with the bourgeoisie, against the proletariat.

All of them furiously attack us for persecuting them. This is true. But they do not say a word about the part they themselves have taken in the Civil War! I think that I shall have to provide the full text of the resolution to be recorded in the minutes, and I shall ask the foreign comrades to study it because it is a historical document in which the issue is raised correctly and which provides excellent material for appraising the controversy between the "socialist" trends in Russia. In between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie there is another class of people, who incline first this way and then the other. This has always been the case in all revolutions, and it is absolutely impossible in capitalist society, in which the proletariat and the bourgeoisie form two hostile camps, for intermediary sections not to exist between them. The existence of these waverers is historically inevitable, and, unfortunately, these elements, who do not know themselves on whose side they will fight tomorrow, will exist for quite some time.

I want to make the practical proposal that a resolution be adopted in which three points shall be specifically mentioned.

First: One of the most important tasks confronting the West-European comrades is to explain to the people the meaning, importance and necessity of the Soviet system. There is a sort of misunderstanding on this question. Although Kautsky and Hilferding are bankrupt as theorists, their recent articles in *Die Freiheit* show that they correctly reflect the mood of the backward sections of the German proletariat. The same thing took place in our country: during the first eight months of the Russian revolution the question of the Soviet organisation was very much discussed, and the workers did not understand what the new system was and whether the Soviets could be transformed into a state machine. In our revolution we advanced along the path of practice, and not of theory. For example, formerly we did not raise the question of the Constituent Assembly from the theoretical side, and we did not say we did not recognise the Constituent Assembly. It was only later, when the Soviet organisations had spread throughout the country and had captured political power, that we decided to dissolve the Constituent Assembly. Now we see that in Hungary and Switzerland the question is much more acute. On the one hand, this is very good: it gives us the firm conviction that in the West-European states the revolution is advancing more quickly and will yield great victories. On the other hand, a certain danger is concealed in it, namely, that the struggle will be so precipitous that the minds of the mass of workers will not keep pace with this development. Even now the significance of the Soviet system is not clear to a large mass of the politically educated German workers, because they have been trained in the spirit of the parliamentary system and amid bourgeois prejudices.

Second: About the spread of the Soviet system. When we hear how quickly the idea of Soviets is spreading in Germany, and even in Britain, it is very important evidence that the proletarian revolution will be victorious. Its progress can be only retarded for a short time. It is quite another thing, however, when Comrades Albert and Platten

tell us that in the rural districts in their countries there are hardly any Soviets among the farm labourers and small peasants. In *Die Rote Fahne* I read an article opposing peasant Soviets, but quite properly supporting Soviets of farm labourers and of poor peasants.¹⁷⁹ The bourgeoisie and their lackeys, like Scheidemann and Co., have already issued the slogan of peasant Soviets. All we need, however, is Soviets of farm labourers and poor peasants. Unfortunately, from the reports of Comrades Albert, Platten and others, we see that, with the exception of Hungary, very little is being done to spread the Soviet system in the countryside. In this, perhaps, lies the real and quite serious danger threatening the achievement of certain victory by the German proletariat. Victory can only be considered assured when not only the urban workers, but also the rural proletarians are organised, and organised not as before—in trade unions and co-operative societies—but in Soviets. Our victory was made easier by the fact that in October 1917 we marched with the peasants, with all the peasants. In that sense, our revolution at that time was a bourgeois revolution. The first step taken by our proletarian government was to embody in a law promulgated on October 26 (old style), 1917, on the next day after the revolution, the old demands of all the peasants which peasant Soviets and village assemblies had put forward under Kerensky. That is where our strength lay; that is why we were able to win the overwhelming majority so easily. As far as the countryside was concerned, our revolution continued to be a bourgeois revolution, and only later, after a lapse of six months, were we compelled within the framework of the state organisation to start the class struggle in the countryside, to establish Committees of Poor Peasants, of semi-proletarians, in every village, and to carry on a methodical fight against the rural bourgeoisie. This was inevitable in Russia owing to the backwardness of the country. In Western Europe things will proceed differently, and that is why we must emphasise the absolute necessity of spreading the Soviet system also to the rural population in proper, perhaps new, forms.

Third: We must say that winning a Communist majority in the Soviets is the principal task in all countries in which

Soviet government is not yet victorious. Our Resolutions' Commission discussed this question yesterday. Perhaps other comrades will express their opinion on it; but I would like to propose that these three points be adopted as a special resolution. Of course, we are not in a position to prescribe the path of development. It is quite likely that the revolution will come very soon in many West-European countries, but we, as the organised section of the working class, as a party, strive and must strive to gain a majority in the Soviets. Then our victory will be assured and no power on earth will be able to do anything against the communist revolution. If we do not, victory will not be secured so easily, and it will not be durable. And so, I would like to propose that these three points be adopted as a special resolution.

Theses published according to the
Pravda text, report according
to the Russian edition of the
minutes checked with the German
edition

3

RESOLUTION TO THE THESES ON BOURGEOIS DEMOCRACY
AND THE DICTATORSHIP OF THE PROLETARIAT

On the basis of these theses and the reports made by the delegates from the different countries, the Congress of the Communist International declares that the chief task of the Communist Parties in all countries where Soviet government has not yet been established is as follows:

- 1) to explain to the broad mass of the workers the historic significance and the political and historical necessity of the new, proletarian, democracy which must replace bourgeois democracy and the parliamentary system;
- 2) to extend the organisation of Soviets among the workers in all branches of industry, among the soldiers in the Army and sailors in the Navy and also among farm labourers and poor peasants;
- 3) to build a stable Communist majority inside the Soviets.

Pravda No. 54, March 11, 1919
and the journal *Communist International* No. 1, May 1, 1919

Published according to
the journal checked
with the *Pravda* text

4

CONCLUDING SPEECH AT THE CLOSING
SESSION OF THE CONGRESS
MARCH 6

That we have been able to gather, despite all the persecution and all the difficulties created by the police, that we have been able without any serious differences and in a brief space of time to reach important decisions on all the vitally urgent questions of the contemporary revolutionary epoch, we owe to the fact that the proletarian masses of the whole world, by their action, have brought up these questions in practice and begun to tackle them.

All we have had to do here has been to record the gains already won by the people in the process of their revolutionary struggle.

Not only in the East-European but also in the West-European countries, not only in the vanquished but also in the victor countries, for example in Britain, the movement in favour of Soviets is spreading farther and farther, and this movement is, most assuredly, a movement pursuing the aim of establishing the new, proletarian democracy. It is the most significant step towards the dictatorship of the proletariat, towards the complete victory of communism.

No matter how the bourgeoisie of the whole world rage, how much they deport or jail or even kill Spartacists and Bolsheviks—all this will no longer help. It will only serve to enlighten the masses, help rid them of the old bourgeois-democratic prejudices and steel them in struggle. The

victory of the proletarian revolution on a world scale is assured. The founding of an international Soviet republic is on the way. (*Stormy applause.*)

Published according to
the Russian edition of the minutes
checked with the German edition

WON AND RECORDED

The only firm gain in a revolution is that which has been won by the mass of the proletariat. The only gain worth recording is that which really has been firmly won.

The founding of the Third, Communist International in Moscow on March 2, 1919, was a record of what has been gained not only by the Russian workers, but also by the German, Austrian, Hungarian, Finnish, Swiss—in a word, by the workers of the world.

Precisely because of this the founding of the Third, Communist International really is firm.

Only four months ago it was impossible to say that Soviet government, the Soviet form of state, was an international achievement. There was something in it, and moreover something essential, which belonged to all capitalist countries as well as to Russia. But, until it had been put to the test, it was still impossible to say what changes, of what depth and importance, the development of the world revolution would bring.

The German revolution has provided this test. An advanced capitalist country, coming after one of the most backward, has demonstrated to the whole world in a matter of a hundred-odd days not only the same principal revolutionary forces and principal direction of the revolution, but also the same principal form of the new, proletarian democracy—the Soviets.

At the same time in Britain, a victor country, the richest in colonies, the longest serving model of "social peace", or so it was reputed, the oldest capitalist country, we can see an extensive, irrepressible, intense and powerful growth of Soviets and of new Soviet forms of mass proletarian struggle—the Shop Stewards Committees.

In America, the strongest and youngest capitalist country, the workers have tremendous sympathy with the Soviets.

The ice has been broken.

The Soviets have triumphed throughout the world.

They have triumphed first and foremost because they have won the workers' sympathy. That is the main thing. No savagery by the imperialist bourgeoisie, no persecution or murder of Bolsheviks can deprive the people of this gain. The more the "democratic" bourgeoisie rage, the firmer the grip these gains will take on the hearts of the workers, on their moods, on their minds, and the more they will inspire their heroic struggle.

The ice has been broken.

That is why the work of the International Conference of Communists in Moscow which founded the Third International has proceeded so easily, so smoothly, with such calm and firm resolution.

We have recorded what has already been won. We have written down what has already taken a firm grip on the people's minds. Everyone knew, and what is more, everyone saw, felt, sensed, each from his own country's experience, that a new proletarian movement was in full swing. Everyone realised that this unprecedentedly strong and deep-going movement cannot be confined to any of the old frameworks, or held in check by the past masters at petty politics, neither by the world-schooled, world-skilled Lloyd Georges and Wilsons of British and American "democratic" capitalism, nor by the Hendersons, Renaudels, Brantings and all the other case-hardened heroes of social-chauvinism.

The new movement is heading towards the dictatorship of the proletariat, making headway despite all the vacillation, despite desperate reverses, despite the unparalleled and incredible "Russian" chaos (if one judges superficially as an onlooker). It is heading for *Soviet government* with the torrential might of millions and tens of millions of workers sweeping everything from their path.

This is what we have recorded. We have embodied in our resolutions, theses, reports and speeches what has already been won.

Marxism, illuminated by the bright light of the new, universally rich experience of the revolutionary workers,

has helped us to understand the inevitability of the present development. It will help the workers of the whole world, who are fighting to overthrow capitalist wage-slavery, more clearly to appreciate the aims of their struggle, to march more firmly along the path already outlined, more confidently and firmly to achieve victory and to consolidate it.

The sounding of the Third, Communist International heralds the international republic of Soviets, the international victory of communism.

March 5, 1919

Pravda No. 51, March 6, 1919
Signed: *N. Lenin*

Published according to
the *Pravda* text

FOUNDING OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

SPEECH AT A JOINT MEETING OF THE ALL-RUSSIA CENTRAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, THE MOSCOW SOVIET, THE MOSCOW COMMITTEE OF THE RUSSIAN COMMUNIST PARTY (BOLSHEVIKS), THE ALL-RUSSIA CENTRAL COUNCIL OF TRADE UNIONS, MOSCOW TRADE UNIONS AND FACTORY COMMITTEES TO MARK THE FOUNDING OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

MARCH 6, 1919

(Stormy ovation.) Comrades, at the First Congress of the Communist International we did not succeed in getting representatives from all countries where this organisation has most faithful friends and where there are workers whose sympathies are entirely with us. Allow me, therefore, to begin with a short quotation which will show you that in reality we have more friends than we can see, than we know and than we were able to assemble here, in Moscow, despite all persecution, despite the entire, seemingly omnipotent, union of the bourgeoisie of the whole world. This persecution has gone to such lengths as to attempt to surround us with a sort of Great Wall of China, and to deport Bolsheviks in dozens from the freest republics of the world. They seem to be scared stiff that ten or a dozen Bolsheviks will infect the whole world. But we, of course, know that this fear is ridiculous—because they have already infected the whole world, because the Russian workers' struggle has already convinced working people everywhere that the destiny of the world revolution is being decided here, in Russia.

Comrades, I have here a copy of *L'Humanité*,¹⁸⁰ a French newspaper whose policy corresponds more to that of our Mensheviks or Right Socialist-Revolutionaries. During the war, this paper was utterly ruthless in its attacks on

those who supported our viewpoint. Today it is defending those who during the war went along with their own bourgeoisie. This very newspaper reports in its issue of January 13, 1919, that a mammoth meeting (as the newspaper itself admits) took place in Paris of active party and trade union members of the Seine Federation, i.e., the district nearest to Paris, the centre of the proletarian movement, the centre of all political life in France. The first speaker was Bracke, a socialist who throughout the war took the same line as our Mensheviks and Right-wing defence advocates. He was meek and mild now. Not a word about a single burning issue! He ended by saying that he was against his government's interference in the struggle of the proletariat of other countries. His words were drowned in applause. The next speaker was a supporter of his, a certain Pierre Laval. He spoke of demobilisation, the burning issue in France today—a country which has probably borne greater sacrifices than any other country in this criminal war. And this country now sees that demobilisation is being dragged out, held up, that there is no desire to carry it through, that preparations are being made for a new war that will obviously demand new sacrifices from the French workers for the sake of settling how much more of the spoils the French or British capitalists will get. The newspaper goes on to say that the crowd listened to the speaker, Pierre Laval, but when he started running down Bolshevism, the protests and excitement stopped the meeting. After that, citizen Pierre Renaudel was refused a hearing, and the meeting ended with a brief statement by citizen Péricat. He is one of the few people in the French labour movement who in the main is in agreement with us. And so, the newspaper has to admit that the speaker who began to attack the Bolsheviks was immediately pulled up.

Comrades, we have not been able to get even one delegate here directly from France, and only one Frenchman, Comrade Guilbeaux, arrived here, and he with great difficulty. (*Stormy applause.*) He will speak here today. He spent months in the prisons of that free republic, Switzerland, being accused of having contact with Lenin and preparing a revolution in Switzerland. He was escorted through Germany by gendarmes and officers, for fear, evidently, that

he might drop a match that would set Germany on fire. But Germany is ablaze without this match. In France, too, as we can see, there are sympathisers with the Bolshevik movement. The French people are probably among the most experienced, most politically conscious, most active and responsive. They will not allow a speaker at a public meeting to strike a false note: he is stopped. Considering the French temperament, he was lucky not to have been dragged down from the rostrum! Therefore, when a newspaper hostile to us admits what took place at this big meeting we can safely say the French proletariat is on our side.

I am going to read another short quotation, from an Italian newspaper. The attempts to isolate us from the rest of the world are so great that we very rarely receive socialist newspapers from abroad. It is a rare thing to receive a copy of the Italian newspaper *Avanti!*,¹⁸¹ the organ of the Italian Socialist Party, a party which participated in Zimmerwald, fought against the war and has now resolved not to attend the yellow congress in Berne, the congress of the old International, which was to be attended by people who had helped their governments to prolong this criminal war. To this day, *Avanti!* is under strict censorship. But in this issue, which arrived here by chance, I read an item on party life in a small locality called Cavriago (probably a remote spot because it cannot be located on the map). It appears that the workers there adopted a resolution supporting their newspaper for its uncompromising stand and declared their approval of the German Spartacists. Then follow the words "Sovietisti russi" which, even though they are in Italian, can be understood all over the world. They sent greetings to the Russian "Sovietisti" and expressed the wish that the programme of the Russian and German revolutionaries should be adopted throughout the world and serve to carry the fight against the bourgeoisie and military domination to a conclusion. When you read a resolution like that, adopted in some Italian Poshekonye,¹⁸² you have every right to say to yourself that the Italian people are on our side, the Italian people understand what the Russian "Sovietisti" are, what the programme of the Russian "Sovietisti" and the German Spartacists is. Yet at that time we had no such programme! We had no common

programme with the German Spartacists, but the Italian workers rejected all they had seen in their bourgeois press, which, bribed as it is by the millionaires and multimillionaires, spreads slander about us in millions of copies. It failed to deceive the Italian workers, who grasped what the Spartacists and the "*Sovietisti*" were and declared that they sympathised with their programme, at a time when this programme did not exist. That is why we found our task so easy at this Congress. All we had to do was to record as a programme what had already been implanted in the minds and hearts of the workers, even those cast away in some remote spot and cut off from us by police and military cordons. That is why we have been able to reach concerted decisions on all the main issues with such ease and complete unanimity. And we are fully convinced that these decisions will meet with a powerful response among workers elsewhere.

The Soviet movement, comrades, is the form which has been won in Russia, which is now spreading throughout the world and the very name of which gives the workers a complete programme. I hope that we, having had the good fortune to develop the Soviet form to victory, will not become swelled-headed about it.

We know very well that the reason we were the first to take part in a Soviet proletarian revolution was not because we were as well or better prepared than other workers, but because we were worse prepared. This is why we were faced with the most savage and decrepit enemy, and it is this that accounted for the outward scale of the revolution. But we also know that the Soviets exist here to this day, that they are grappling with gigantic difficulties which originate from an inadequate cultural level and from the burden that has weighed down on us for more than a year, on us who stand alone at our posts, at a time when we are surrounded on all sides by enemies, and when, as you know perfectly well, harrowing ordeals, the hardships of famine and terrible suffering have befallen us.

Those who directly or indirectly side with the bourgeoisie often try to appeal to the workers and provoke indignation among them by pointing to the severe sufferings of the workers today. And we tell them: yes, these sufferings are

severe and we do not conceal them from you. We tell the workers that, and they know it well from their own experience. You can see we are fighting not only to win socialism for ourselves, not only to ensure that our children shall only recollect capitalists and landowners as prehistoric monsters; we are fighting to ensure that the workers of the whole world triumph together with us.

And this First Congress of the Communist International, which has made the point that throughout the world the Soviets are winning the sympathy of the workers, shows us that the victory of the world communist revolution is assured. (*Applause.*) The bourgeoisie will continue to vent their fury in a number of countries; the bourgeoisie there are just beginning to prepare the destruction of the best people, the best representatives of socialism, as is evident from the brutal murder of Rosa Luxemburg and Karl Liebknecht by the whiteguards. These sacrifices are inevitable. We seek no agreement with the bourgeoisie, we are marching to the final and decisive battle against them. But we know that after the ordeal, agony and distress of the war, when the people throughout the world are fighting for demobilisation, when they feel they have been betrayed and appreciate how incredibly heavy the burden of taxation is that has been placed upon them by the capitalists who killed tens of millions of people to decide who would receive more of the profits—we know that these brigands' rule is at an end!

Now that the meaning of the word "Soviet" is understood by everybody, the victory of the communist revolution is assured. The comrades present in this hall saw the founding of the first Soviet republic; now they see the founding of the Third, Communist International (*applause*), and they will all see the founding of the World Federative Republic of Soviets. (*Applause.*)

Brief report published
in *Pravda* No. 52,
March 7, 1919

Published in full
in May 1919

Published according to
the verbatim report

NOTE TO STALIN ON REORGANISATION OF STATE CONTROL^{**}

I think the following should be added to the decree on control:

- 1) formation of central (and local) bodies with workers' participation;
- 2) introduction by law of the systematic participation of witnesses from among the workers, with compulsory participation of up to two-thirds women;
- 3) giving immediate priority to the following as our urgent tasks:
 - (a) lightning inquiries into citizens' complaints
 - (b) combating red tape
 - (c) revolutionary measures to combat abuses and red tape
 - (d) special attention to boosting labour productivity, and
 - (e) to increasing the quantity of products, etc.

Written March 8, 1919

Published according to
the manuscript

